DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 149 UD 012 151

AUTHOR	Justman, Joseph
TITLE	An Evaluation of Non-Public School Participation in District Decentralized ESEA Title I Programs, 1970-1971 School Year.
INSTITUTION	Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
REPORT NO	Pub-71-71
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	150p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Federal Programs; Guidance Programs; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parochial Schools; Principals; *Private Schools; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Remedial Programs; *School Involvement
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I Programs; *New York City

ABSTRACT

In the 1970-71 school year, 24 of the 28 local school districts in New York City submitting proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 had provided for some degree of non-public participation in a total of 53 separate projects. The evaluation reported here is limited to two aspects of non-public school involvement: (1) evaluation of non-public school involvement in the planning of District decentralized Title I programs, and (2) evaluation of the functioning of those programs organized by 11 Districts in which services were made available only to non-public schools. Participation in planning took three forms: (1) direct participation in the deliberations of the District planning group on the part of the principals of the non-public schools in that District; or, (2) indirect participation in the work of the District planning group via a representative who transmitted the thinking of the principals of non-public schools who met as a subgroup; or, (3) direct planning for an individual non-public school through meetings of the school principal and District personnel on a one-to-one basis. In several districts, two of these approaches were utilized. (Author/JM)

ED 060149

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
HARRY N. RIVLIN, DEAN

AN EVALUATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

1970-1971 SCHOOL YEAR

Prepared By

JOSEPH JUSTMAN
Evaluation Director

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1970-1971 school year.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

JOSEPH JUSTMAN, DIRECTOR

Publication No. 71-71 August 1971

UD012151

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

1970-1971 SCHOOL YEAR

FUNCTION NUMBERS:

33-11612

35-11618

41-11615

43-11613

61-11616

65-11609

69-11614

73-11608

89-11605

93-11610

95-11605

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A long list of representatives of the public and non-public schools contributed to the findings presented in this report; Title I Coordinators, Program Coordinators, Principals, Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Students, and Headquarters Title I personnel. To all of them, our gratitude for their patience and cooperation.

The Evaluation Team

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Executive Summary	1
II.	Introduction	5
III.	The Extent of Non-Public School Participation in Planning	9
IV.	Non-Public School Participation in Programs	38
V.	Evaluation of Selected Programs	55
VI.	Recommendations	139

CHAPTER I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the 1970-1971 school year, 28 of the 30 local school districts in New York City submitted proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10). The projects described in the district proposals made varying provision for the participation of non-public school pupils. An analysis of the district proposals, supplemented by questionnaires to principals of non-public schools indicated that 24 of the 28 school districts had, in fact, provided for some degree of non-public school participation in a total of 53 separate projects.

In many instances, the Community Districts elected to have their decentralized ESEA Title I programs evaluated by an agency designated by the District, rather than by the Central Board of Education. As a consequence, a number of agencies were involved in the evaluation of these 53 programs, and the evaluation conducted by the Institute for Research and Evaluation was limited to two aspects of non-public school involvement: (1) evaluation of non-public school involvement in the planning of District decentralized Title I programs, and (2) evaluation of the functioning of those programs organized by eleven Districts in which services were made available only to non-public schools.

In general, the pattern of participation in Title I programs planning on the part of representatives of the non-public school presented a far more positive picture than that noted in the 1969-1970 school year. Participation in planning took three forms: (a) direct participation in the deliberations of the District planning group on the part of the principals of the non-public schools in that District, or (b) indirect participation in the work of the District planning group via a representative who transmitted the thinking of the principals of non-public schools who met as a subgroup, or (c) direct planning for an individual non-public school through meetings of the school principal and District personnel on a one-to-one basis. In several districts, two of these approaches were utilized.

Apparently, considerable effort was made to involve non-public school principals in planning. Of the 129 principals of non-public schools (75% of the total group) who responded to a direct question asking whether they had been invited to attend planning sessions, only 20 (15.5%) responded in the negative. The others all reported that they had either received an invitation to attend or had been represented by a designee.

It is interesting to note that, in 11 Districts, the non-public school principals opted for a single representative to the District Advisory Committee. This approach was far more common during the current school year than during the 1969-1970 school year. Moreover, instances in which principals of non-public schools voiced complaints concerning lack of an invitation to attend planning sessions were far less frequent.

Although there was greater participation in the planning process on the part of the representatives of the non-public schools during the current year than during the 1969-1970 school year, actual participation in the programs that were organized left much to be desired. In response to a questionnaire, 30, (17.4%) of the 172 principals of eligible non-public schools indicated that they had not been invited to participate in one or more of the programs permitting involvement of non-public schools that had been organized by the Districts in which their schools were located. Indeed, 28 (16.3%) of these 172 principals indicated that they had not even been informed that their schools were eligible to participate in these programs. It should be noted, too, that only 83 (48.3%) of the 172 principals replied to the questionnaire. Thus, in actuality, one-third of the principals who replied to the questionnaire disclaimed any knowledge that their schools were eligible to participate in one or more of the decentralized programs that were developed.

Bearing in mind the limited scope of this evaluation report, the following general suggestions are advanced for consideration by the Central Board of Education and the Community Districts:

1. The decentralized ESEA Title I Umbrella in a given Community District should be looked upon as a single package, embodying services to disadvantaged children enrolled in both public and non-public schools. It would follow, therefore, that planning for programs directed to both public and non-public schools should be regarded as a unitary activity.

2. Greater provision should be made for the involvement of non-public school personnel (particularly the administrators of non-public schools) in the planning stage of the development of the Title I Umbrella.

3. Improved lines of communication should be established between Title I coordinators and administrators of the non-public schools.

4. The relationship of centralized and decentralized ESEA Title I programs merits reexamination to eliminate the existing conflict of authority.

5. The functions to be performed by teachers and paraprofessionals serving in non-public schools should be determined jointly by the program coordinator and the administrator of the non-public school.

6. Administrators of non-public schools should participate in the process of recruitment and training of Title I teachers and paraprofessionals.

7. Greater efforts should be made to make certain that supplies required for a given program be available when needed.

Specific recommendations concerning the eleven District programs directed solely to non-public school pupils are presented in Chapter V, which considers each of these programs as a separate unit.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION

In the 1970-1971 school year, the 28 Community School Districts in New York City which included non-public schools eligible for participation in Title I programs submitted proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10).

In general, two types of projects were developed by the individual Districts:

1. Decentralized projects, supervised by the Community District. In some instances, provision was made for joint participation of public and non-public school children in a given activity; in others, services were made available to non-public schools only.

2. Plug-ins to centralized projects, such as Corrective Reading, Corrective Math, and Guidance Services, where supervision was provided by the Central Board of Education.

This evaluation deals only with the first type of project, those supervised by the Community District. As one would expect, the projects described in the District proposals varied widely in number, nature, and scope, and made varying provision for participation of non-public school pupils.

Initial review of the District proposals soon made it clear that the exact nature of non-public school involvement was not fully indicated in the descriptions of the projects for which funding was requested. Moreover, many of the Districts faced problems in recruitment, and full implementation of their projected programs was delayed until relatively late in the school year. It proved to be necessary to devote considerable time and effort to the task of establishing a definitive account of the extent of non-public school participation in the District projects, as the latter became operative. A final list of the projects calling for non-public school participation did not become available until the end of March, 1971. As of that time, a total of 53 separate projects that incorporated eligible non-public schools had been implemented by 24 of the 28 Districts. The following chart indicates the nature of those projects that were organized, and the Districts in which such projects were implemented.

TABLE I

ESEA Title I Projects Common to Indicated Districts

Type	Districts
1. Remedial Reading Programs	1, 2, 13, 17, 28, 29, 30, 31
2. Paraprofessional Assistance	1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 19, 21, 24
3. Bilingual Programs	2, 4, 9, 10, 12
4. After School Study Centers	14, 15, 19
5. Homework Helper Programs	1, 2, 14
6. Trip Programs	1, 2, 15*
7. Guidance Programs	2**, 3, 16, 28
8. Creative Arts Programs	7, 14, 19
9. Social Studies Programs	14, 15
10. Library Programs	2, 16
11. Science Programs	16, 19
12. Recreational Programs	7, 14

* Two programs organized in this area
** Three programs organized in this area

In addition, four programs that were unique to a single District were organized: Adaptive Physical Education - District 14; Language Arts - District 23; an Enrichment Program - District 28; Remedial Mathematics - District 30.

In several Districts, non-public schools participated in planning, but no programs falling within the purview of this report were organized (Cf. page 8).

A. THE SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report, covering the 1970-1971 school year, differs in many respects from that prepared by the Institute for Research and Evaluation for the 1969-1970 school year. In the latter year, all of the projects that involved participation of non-public schools organized on a decentralized basis were evaluated by a single agency. During the current year, many of the Community Districts elected to have their decentralized ESEA Title I programs evaluated by an agency designated by the District, rather than by the Central Board of Education. As a consequence, a number of agencies were involved in the evaluation of the programs listed in Table 1.

The evaluation conducted by the Institute was limited to two aspects of non-public school involvement: (1) evaluation of non-public school participation in the planning of District decentralized ESEA Title I programs; and (2) evaluation of the functioning of those programs organized by eleven Districts in which services were made available only to non-public schools. Plug-ins to centralized programs were not to be evaluated by the Institute; such programs were evaluated by other agencies. Programs entailing joint participation of public and non-public school pupils were not to be evaluated by the Institute; again, such programs were to be evaluated by other agencies.

CHAPTER III

THE EXTENT OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING

The sections that follow present an analysis of the decentralized programs in each of the 28 Community School Districts, and of the extent of verifiable non-public school involvement in these decentralized programs, as such involvement could be ascertained. Data concerning involvement is based upon review of proposals submitted by the 28 Districts, upon interviews with and questionnaires to Title I Coordinators in the Districts, upon interviews with and questionnaires to non-public school liaison personnel in a number of Districts, and upon questionnaires to principals of eligible non-public schools in the Districts.

A. DISTRICT 1

Nine non-public schools (eight elementary schools and one K-12 school) in this District were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. The total allocation for non-public school programs in this District was $116,246.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I Projects were planned with the assistance of an advisory panel consisting of 33 persons. Of these, one person was identified as a representative of the non-public schools. In addition, three parents, one from each of three non-public schools, were designated as members of the panel.

According to the request for funding, the Advisory Panel held 14 meetings during the period from February 9, 1970 through May 7, 1970 to plan the Title I program in the District. The non-public school representative attended five of these meetings in her dual capacity as Archdiocesan representative and principal of one of the non-public schools in the District. A parent, representing the one K-12 non-public school in the District, attended four of the meetings held by the panel. The other two parent representatives from non-public schools evidently were not present at any meetings. A member of the staff of one non-public school was also present at eight of the 14 sessions of the group. It should be noted, however, that this non-public school staff member served as a representative of a community corporation, rather than as a non-public school representative.

Eight of the nine principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire dealing with their participation in the planning of ESEA Title I programs. Of these, four indicated that they had not been invited to participate.

One principal indicated that she had been invited to attend meetings concerning the program, but that notices of the meeting were received after the meeting had been held. Attendance at one meeting was reported by two non-public school principals. Evidently, the one non-public school principal who attended more than a single meeting of the advisory panel also served served as Archiocesan District Representative. She reports that, in addition to attending meetings, she spoke to the District Title I Coordinator on the telephone frequently.

Although considerable time and effort were devoted to the planning of the Title I umbrella in Community District 1, the indications are that, other than the principal serving as the Archdiocesan District representative, few of the principals of the non-public schools played an active role in the development of the program for their schools.

B. DISTRICT 2

Sixteen non-public schools (fifteen elementary schools and one high school) were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized

Title I programs in this District. The total allocation for non-public school programs in this District was $172,592.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I projects were planned with the assistance of a Title I Advisory Committee consisting of 16 persons.. Of these, one person was identified as a representative of the non-public schools.

According to the request for funding, the Advisory Committee held six meetings during the period from June 2, 1970 and June 25, 1970 to plan the Title I program in the District. No details were given, in the request for funding, concerning the participation of the non-public school representative in these meetings. Two letters, supplemented by telephone calls, directed to the Title I Coordinator in the District, asking for details concerning non-public school participation, were unanswered; a questionnaire addressed to the non-public school representative also brought forth no reply.

Twelve of the 16 principals of the eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire dealing with their participation in the planning of ESEA Title I programs. Of these, three indicated that they had not been invited to attend meetings devoted to planning. Six others noted that they had attended from one to three such meetings, but that these sessions were organized by the Archdiocesan non-public school representative, and could not be considered meetings of the Advisory Committee. One newly-appointed principal reported that she had not been invited to attend meetings, but that her predecessor had been present at "many meetings." No indication was given whether these represented sessions of the Advisory Committee or the non-public school group.

It would appear that only two or, at most, three principals of non-public schools participated in the discussions of the Advisory Committee. One of these principals, who served as Archdiocesan District representative, reported attendance at two of the six meetings held by the Advisory Committee. The principal of the one secondary school among the non-public schools eligible for participation reported that she attended at least six planning sessions for the organization of "plug-in" programs.

It would appear that direct involvement of non-public school principals in the planning process was relatively infrequent. To some degree, however, an indirect contribution to the deliberations of the planning group was made through the organization of a non-public school subgroup whose thinking was transmitted to the Advisory Committee by the Archdiocesan representative.

C. DISTRICT 3

Ten non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The total allocation for non-public school programs was $118,784.

The Title I Program in this District was developed with the advice of an Advisory Committee. The request for funding submitted by the District did not specify the members of this Committee, nor did it give a complete listing of the meetings held by the group. Only two meetings of the Committee were referred to; one of these was an open hearing.

The District Coordinator of Funded Programs, in response to a written request for details concerning non-public school participation in Title I planning, indicated that a representative of the non-public schools served as a member of the Advisory Committee. In addition, he reported that "non-public school representatives attended and spoke at Local School Board meetings where Title I matters were discussed." He also noted that "representatives of the non-public schools met with the Central Board staff, District Office Staff, and Archdiocese staff in making final allocations of professional and paraprofessional staff in the non-public schools under Title I."

Eight of the 10 principals of the non-public schools eligible for participation in Title I programs in this District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Seven of the eight respondents indicated that they had been invited to attend a single meeting with the Coordinator of Funded Programs; the eighth respondent reported that he had not been invited to participate in planning. The respondents who were present at the meeting all noted that the session was devoted to a consideration of allocation of funds to the non-public schools.

It would appear that moderate participation of representatives of the non-public schools was achieved in this District.

D. DISTRICT 4

Eight non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. A total sum of $177,048 was allocated for non-public school programs.

Community District 4, as presently organized, was formed from parts of the former Districts 2 and 4. In view of the fact that current District lines were not set prior to the date for submission of the Title I Umbrella, it was necessary to hold sessions of two Local Advisory Committees in planning the Title I program for the "new" District that was to be formed. According to the request for funding that was submitted by the newly-organized District, five such meetings were held between April 17, 1970 and August 27, 1970. Evidently, all of these meetings were attended by the District Superintendent of the East Harlem Parochial Schools, who served as Archdiocesan District Representative.

Six of the eight principals of non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Of these, four indicated that they had not been invited to participate. Two reported that they had been invited to participate; one of these two principals noted that she had attended "a few" meetings, but had not taken an active role. Five of the six principals who responded designated the Archdiocesan District Superintendent as their representative at planning sessions, including the one principal who had attended as an observer.

The Archdiocesan District Superintendent reports that, as representative of the eight parochial schools in the Community District, he was given "complete support" by the Community District office, and that the program proposed by the non-public schools was approved on the local level.

It is quite clear that, in this District, the non-public schools opted to send a single representative to the Advisory Committee, rather than to ask for direct participation. Although there was virtually no participation of the principals of these schools in direct planning of the Title I program, this was a matter of choice on their part.

E. DISTRICT 5

Seven non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The funds allocated for non-public school programs was $115,400.

Decentralized ESEA programs in this District were developed with the community agencies, including one person representing the non-public schools. This committee held six meetings, from February 18, 1970 through April 20, 1970, that were devoted to planning. The request for funding submitted by the District, which gave the dates on which these sessions were held, did not specify participants. The District Superintendent of the East Harlem Parochial Schools was identified as the representative of the non-public schools.

All of the principals of the seven eligible non-public schools responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning of the District Title I program. Three of the respondents indicated that they had been invited to attend meetings with regard to planning; two reported attendance at two planning sessions, the other had been present at one such session. These sessions were devoted to a consideration of the nature of the programs to be developed for non-public schools, and led to the formulation of a specific set of proposals. One of the respondents indicated that she served as "area representative" of the non-public schools, and that she had attended a subsequent meeting at which program implementation was considered.

It would appear that there was considerable confusion on the part of the non-public schools in the District concerning participation in planning. The Community District office recognized one person as the non-public school representative, while another refers to herself in similar terms. Three of the four principals who reported that they were not invited to participate in planning indicated that they were not represented by anyone else; the fourth designates a person (ostensibly the principal of a non-public school) as her representative; the latter, however, did not serve in that capacity.

To some degree, this confusion may have resulted from the reorganization of District lines in accordance with the decentralization process. Some of the non-public schools were switched from one district to another in the course of this reorganization, and normal channels of communication may have been cut. In any event, it is clear that involvement of non-public schools in the planning process was not effected, to any great degree, in this District.

F. DISTRICT 6

Five non-public elementary schools and one non-public high school in District 6 were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. A sum of $85,337 was allocated for non-public school programs.

Title I programs in District 6 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee. The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that this group held 10 meetings during the period from January 22 through August 31, 1970, inclusive. Although the exact membership of the group was not specified, two individuals were identified as representatives of the non-public schools at these meetings. The request for funding also notes that one of these persons attended the meeting held on February 18, and that the second attended meetings held on June 25, August 26, August 28, and August 31. A supplementary letter from the Assistant Coordinator of Title I programs reports that the first person served as chairman of a meeting, not listed in the request for funding, that was held on April 27. This letter also indicates that the second attended four sessions of the group, but only two of the dates of these sessions coincide with those given in the request for funding.

All five of the principals of the non-public elementary schools responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in program planning. Four of the five respondents indicated that they had not been invited to participate in such planning; the only respondent who gave an affirmative response was one of the two persons who were designated as non-public school representatives. Two of the respondents who noted that they had not been invited to attend also referred to this individual as their representative; the other two indicated that they had not been represented. The latter two principals both made the point that communication between the District office and the non-public schools was very poor.

Here, too, it would appear that direct participation of non-public school representatives in the planning process was minimal; evidently indirect representation to the Advisory Committee through a single representative was the preferred approach.

G. DISTRICT 7

Eleven non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The total allocation for non-public school programs in District 7 was $210,946.

Title I programs in District 7 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of 19 members. The District Superintendent of the Catholic schools in the area, served as representative of the non-public schools on this Committee. The group held 19 meetings from January 5, 1970, through August 10, 1970, inclusive, to plan the District Title I program. A letter from the Title I Coordinator in the District reports that the District Superintendent of the Catholic schools attended five of these meetings. In addition, three meetings were held with him in September and October, after the separate allocation for non-public schools in the District had been determined. The coordinator reports that the non-public representative received minutes of all meetings held by the Advisory Committee, and that he was kept aware of the planning activities via frequent telephone calls. The non-public school representative reports that he was "an active member of the committee."

Nine of the eleven principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning of Title I programs in the District. Four of these respondents indicated that they had been invited to participate; three principals reported attendance at two meetings, one principal was present at one planning session. Three of the five principals who reported that they had not been invited to participate indicated that the District Superintendent of the Catholic schools served as their representative, as did three of the four respondents who had received invitations to attend.

In this District, as in District 4, major reliance was placed upon a representative to present the views of the non-public school principals. From their reports, it was evident that they met with their representative to plan programs related to their needs, which were then transmitted to the Advisory Committee. Direct involvement of the principals in sessions of the Committee was relatively uncommon.

H. DISTRICT 8

Only two non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. A total of $23,576 was allocated to non-public school programs.

Title I programs in this District were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee. The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that this group held twelve meetings from January 7, 1970, through July 17, 1970, that were devoted to planning. Membership on the Committee was not specified, but apparently representatives of the two non-public schools in the District participated in planning sessions.

A request for additional information directed to the District Title I Coordinator did not give rise to further data; the reply simply reproduced the material already available in the request for funding.

Both of the principals of the eligible non-public schools responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. One reported attendance at four meetings of the planning group; the other attendance at three such meetings. The indications are, then, that there was moderate involvement of the non-public schools in program planning in this District.

I. DISTRICT 9

Five non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The total allocation for non-public school programs was $75,780.

Title I programs in District 9 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Panel. The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that this group, membership of which was not specified, held six meetings during the period from January 16, 1970, through March 13, 1970. Minutes of five of these meetings were made available to the evaluation team by the Title I Coordinator. These minutes indicate that three of these sessions were attended by a Diocesan representative, and that a representative of one of the non-public schools was present at four of these sessions.

In addition, two meetings were held that included only representatives of the non-public schools as participants. The first, held on May 14, 1970, was attended by four representatives of three of the five non-public schools in the District and by the Diocesan representative. The second, held on September 21, 1970, included six representatives of the five non-public schools in the District and the Diocesan representative.

Four of the principals of non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in program planning. Three of the four respondents indicated that they had been invited to attend planning sessions; two reported attendance at two such sessions, the third attendance at "several" sessions. The fourth respondent reported that he had not been invited to attend, and had not been represented by anyone else. Yet, this respondent was listed as a participant in the minutes of the two meetings held with non-public school representatives.

It would appear, then, that there was considerable participation in planning on the part of representatives of the non-public schools in this District.

J. DISTRICT 10

Only two non-public elementary schools were certified as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 10. A sum of $24,028 was allocated for non-public school programs in the District.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that four representatives of the non-public schools attended the one planning session organized by the District. This large group meeting, which was held in March 1970, was supplemented by meetings with the principals of the two non-public schools in the District after final allocation of funds was made. Representatives of the non-public schools also were present at the open hearing at which the total program was presented to the community.

Each of these principals completed a questionnaire concerning their participation in planning. Both respondents indicated that they had attended three meetings devoted to planning, in which they worked out the details of programs for their schools, with the assistance of the Title I Coordinator.

Here, too, there was apparently considerable involvement of the representatives of non-public schools in the planning process.

K. DISTRICT 12

Four non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The total sum allocated to non-public school programs was $69,093.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I projects were planned with the assistance of a District Advisory Board. The request for funding also referred to a Principals' Retreat held during the week-end of October 18, 1969, and to a workshop session held on July 14, 1970. In addition, the request gave a list of the agencies and their representatives involved in planning activities. There was no reference to any representatives of the non-public schools in this list, although a statement was made to the effect that non-public school representatives were present at the April 27 meeting.

The request for budget modification submitted by the District made reference to three planning sessions, held on September 4, 17, and 23, 1970, that were attended by non-public school representatives. Three non-public school representatives attended the first of these meetings; all four schools were represented at the second; only one school was represented at the third. A representative of the Diocesan staff was also present at the second meeting.

Three of the four principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Two of these respondents noted that they had attended three sessions devoted to planning; the other reported attendance at two such sessions. It may be assumed that these respondents were referring to the September meetings noted above.

The indications are, then, that there was moderate participation in program planning on the part of representatives of the non-public schools in this District.

L. DISTRICT 13

Nine non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in Title I programs in this District. The total sum allocated for non-public school programs was $137,397.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee, which held weekly meetings. Although the request listed only four such meetings (June 10, June 18, August 6, and September 10, 1970) the District Title I Coordinator indicated that six additional meetings were held on the following dates: May 14, May 21, May 28, June 3, June 11, and June 25. All of the nine eligible non-public schools were listed among the agencies participating in planning activities, as was a representative of the Diocesan office. Evidently, the Diocesan Staff Aide held separate meetings with the principals of non-public schools in the District, and presented their point of view to the Advisory Committee.

Five of the principals of the nine non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Four of the respondents indicated that they had attended meetings dealing with program planning. One reported attendance at six such sessions, one at four sessions, and two at three sessions. Two of these respondents referred to the Diocesan Staff Aide as coordinator of these sessions. One respondent, however, observed that she had not participated in planning, and that she was not represented by anyone else.

It would appear, then, that non-public school participation in planning in this District took much the same form as that noted in District 4, in that a Diocesan representative participated in the deliberations of the Advisory Committee while holding separate meetings to consider their own needs.

M. DISTRICT 14

Twenty-one non-public elementary schools and one non-public secondary school were designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 14. The total allocation for non-public school programs was $183,534.

Title I programs in District 14 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of 21 members, two of whom represented the non-public schools. The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that the Advisory Committee held four meetings between June 5, 1970, and June 29, 1970, for planning purposes. However, no data were available concerning the number of sessions of the Advisory Committee attended by non-public school representatives. The District Title I Coordinator reported that no minutes were kept of meetings of the group.

Fourteen of the 22 principals of the non-public schools responded to a questionnaire concerning participation in program planning; the responses of the two non-public school representatives to the Advisory Committee were of particular interest. One reports attendance at 15 to 20 such meetings ("every time there was a meeting"); the other estimates that he had attended 10 meetings. Evidently, either the request for funding did not list all of the meetings that were held, or the two respondents included in their tabulation of meetings attended those held with the school principals whom they represented in the District-wide Advisory Committee.

Of the twelve other respondents to the questionnaire, nine reported that they had been invited to attend planning sessions; one reported attendance at ten such meetings, another at eight meetings, a third at six meetings, a fourth at three meetings. Three respondents, all from Hebrew Day Schools, reported that they had attended two planning sessions. Two respondents noted that they had not been invited to participate in planning; one of these respondents indicated that a colleague served as her representative.

If the responses of these principals are characteristic of the total approach in the District, it is apparent that there is a comparatively high degree of involvement of representatives of the non-public schools in the planning process. The observation made by one of the non-public school representatives is pertinent: "...every courtesy has been extended to me by way of invitation. I have been informed of each meeting by mail and in the case of an emergency meeting, by telephone. I have been active in participation at the meetings. My suggestions and ideas have been well received and the group has acted upon the different suggestions I have made... I appreciate the excellent communication that exists."

It would appear that, in this District, non-public school principals have taken an active role in planning in the Advisory Committee, both through their representatives and directly.

O. DISTRICT 15

Fourteen non-public elementary schools and one non-public K-11 school were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 15. A sum of $177,443 was set aside for non-public school programs.

Title I programs in District 15 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of 26 members, one of whom served as representative of the non-public schools. This Committee held 15 meetings from October 7, 1969 through June 5, 1970 devoted to planning activities. Although no data concerning attendance at sessions of the Committee were readily available, it appears that the non-public school representative was present at all meetings of the group.

Eleven of the 15 principals of the non-public schools responded to a questionnaire concerning participation in the planning process. Eight of the respondents, all of whom were principals of Catholic schools, reported that they were represented by one of their members. The principals of the two Greek Orthodox schools reported that they had not been invited to participate and had not been represented by anyone else. No response was received from the principals of the Hebrew Day School or of the Episcopal School in the District.

The representative of the Catholic schools indicated that he attended meetings, "three times monthly," of the Advisory Committee. He reports meeting with the principals of the Catholic schools as a group, and then working with the District office in their behalf. He notes that his reception by the District was excellent.

The indications are, then, that most of the principals of non-public schools in this District opted for representation by a colleague at Advisory Committee meetings. In large measure, however, this practice appears to be characteristic of the Catholic schools in the District.

P. DISTRICT 16

Eight non-public elementary schools and one K-11 school were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 16. A sum of $141,966 was allocated for non-public school programs in this District.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that a Title I Review Committee of 16 members, two of whom served as non-public school representatives. This Committee held monthly meetings. However, no specific dates on which the Committee met were given nor was there any indication of the number of meetings attended by the non-public school representatives. A letter to the District Office, asking for this information, was not answered.

Eight of the nine principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Six of the eight respondents reported that they had been invited to participate; the other two noted that a colleague served as their representative to the Review Committee. It was evident, from their responses, that the procedure adopted in District 16 paralleled that in District 15. The principals of the Catholic schools in the District met as a subgroup, with one direct representative to the Review Committee. The principal of the one Hebrew Day School in the District reported direct attendance at several meetings of the Review Committee; the newly-assigned principal of the one Lutheran school in the District had not yet attended meetings of the Review Committee, although his predecessor had done so.

Q. DISTRICT 17

Six non-public elementary and two non-public secondary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 17. A total of $65,822 was allotted for non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee on

State and Federal Programs. Although a large number of representatives of community organizations and agencies attended the sixteen sessions devoted to planning the program for the District, the exact membership of the Committee was not specified. Representatives of the non-public schools participated in 14 of these 16 meetings, which covered the period from November 19, 1969 through August 18, 1970. According to the District Coordinator of Funded Programs, these meetings were supplemented by telephone calls and individual conferences with non-public school representatives.

Five of the eight principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. Two respondents reported that they had been invited to participate in planning; three noted that they had not been invited to attend meetings of a planning group. One of the respondents who responded affirmatively served as a representative of the non-public schools; all of the other respondents indicated that a designated representative served in their stead.

The indications are, then, that there was considerable representation of the non-public schools in the planning process. Here, too, the approaches to planning took the form of indirect participation via a representative, rather than direct personal participation of the non-public school principals.

R. DISTRICT 18

Only one school in this district was designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 18. The small sum of $2,538 was allocated for non-public school programs.

Non-public school participation in planning of Title I programs in the District took the form of individual conferences with the principal of the one eligible school.

S. DISTRICT 19

Four non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 19. A sum of $70,109 was allocated to non-public school programs.

Title I programs in District 19 were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee. This group held 14 meetings from October 9, 1969 through June 5, 1970 for the purpose of program planning. Although the total membership of the Advisory Committee was not specified in the request for funding submitted by the District, the minutes of the Advisory Committee were made available to the evaluation team by the District Title I Coordinator. Reference to these minutes reveals that a representative of the non-public schools was present at eight of the 14 meetings that were held. In addition, the District Title I coordinator reported that three individual conferences were held with a representative of the non-public schools to discuss program implementation.

All four of the principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning participation in the planning process. One respondent noted that she served as non-public school representative to the Advisory Committee, and had attended five meetings of that group. Other non-public school representatives attended the three additional meetings. The other respondents all indicated that their representative attended meetings, and that they had met with her on at least two occasions to discuss needs which were to be transmitted to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

Here, too, is another example of the pattern noted in several other Districts: a single representative of the non-public schools met with an

Advisory Committee, with the principals of the non-public schools opting to meet as a separate group.

T. DISTRICT 20

Two non-public elementary schools and two non-public schools for exceptional children were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 20. A sum of $15,398 was allocated for non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an advisory group, which held meetings to plan the program during the week of May 7, 1970. The membership of the Advisory group was not specified, nor was there any reference to representatives of the non-public schools in the document submitted by the District. A request for these data was not answered by the District Title I Coordinator.

Three of the four principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in the planning process. All three respondents indicated that they had been invited to participate in planning the Title I program in the District; all three reported that they had attended two meetings of the advisory group.

Evidently, there was a moderate degree of participation in the planning process on the part of non-public school representatives in this District.

U. DISTRICT 21

Three non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 21. A sum of $11,957 was allocated to non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of

37 persons, four of whom were representatives of the non-public schools. Only one of these non-public school representatives was drawn from a school that was designated as eligible for participation in Title I programs; the other three were drawn from non-eligible schools. The District Supervisor of State and Federal Programs reports that five meetings were held by the Advisory Committee; all of these meetings were attended by the designated representative of the eligible non-public schools. Representatives of the non-eligible, non-public schools attended a single meeting held by the advisory group.

All three of the principals of the eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in program planning. All three of the respondents indicated that they had elected to be represented by the Assistant Principal of one of the eligible non-public schools.

In this District, as in many others, the non-public school approach to participation in program planning took the form of representation on the advisory group by a single person.

V. DISTRICT 23

One non-public elementary school was designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in this District. The sum allotted for non-public school programs was $15,342.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicates that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of a Title I Advisory Committee of 17 members, one of whom represented the non-public school in the District. This Committee met on September 28, 1970 and October 6, 1970. A public hearing on the projected program was held on September 30, 1970. In addition, the non-public school representative met with the District Title I Coordinator on September 29 and October 7.

In response to a questionnaire, the non-public school representative indicated that she had attended one session of the Advisory Committee that was devoted to a discussion of allocation of funds.

In view of the fact that only a single non-public school was involved, it would appear that there was adequate participation in planning on the part of the non-public school representative.

W. DISTRICT 24

Two non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 24. A sum of $16,921 was allocated for non-public school programs.

Although no information concerning program planning was given in the request for funding submitted by the District, minutes of all meetings held by the Title I Committee in the District were made available to the evaluation team by the District Title I Coordinator. The Title I Committee held eight planning sessions in the period from January 13, 1970, through December 14, 1970. These sessions were attended by varying numbers of representatives of the schools and community agencies. Of the eight sessions for which minutes were provided, all but two were attended by either one or two representatives of the non-public schools in the District.

The principals of the two non-public schools were asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning program planning. The one principal who responded indicated that she had been invited to participate, and had attended one meeting. This is confirmed by the minutes. It should be noted, in this connection, that representatives from the other non-public school were present at five meetings, and a representative from the Diocesan office at three.

It would appear, then, that there was considerable participation in planning by representatives of the non-public schools.

X. DISTRICT 27

One non-public elementary school in District 27 was designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs. A sum of $12,352 was allocated for non-public school programs in the District.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an advisory panel consisting of 35 persons, two of whom were representatives of the non-public school in the District. The request for funding noted that meetings of this advisory panel were held during April, May, June, and July of 1970, but there is no indication of the number of meetings held by the group, nor was any data given concerning the number of sessions attended by the non-public school representatives. No reply was received to two letters addressed to the District Title I Coordinator asking for additional information regarding the functioning of the advisory panel.

The principal of the non-public school in the District did respond to a questionnaire regarding participation in program planning. She indicated that she was present at all meetings of the advisory panel, with the exception of those held after the non-public school term ended.

Evidently, there was adequate representation of the non-public school in program planning in this District.

Y. DISTRICT 28

Three non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible to participate in decentralized Title I programs in District 28. A sum of $23,294 was allocated for non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District gave no indication of the steps taken in planning the Title I program. However, the membership of the Title I planning group and minutes of the meetings held by the group were made available to the evaluation team by the District Title I Coordinator. Two advisory groups participated in program planning for the 1970-1971 school year. The first group, which met during the 1969-1970 school year, included 32 persons, four of whom were representatives of non-public schools. This group was replaced by a second planning group, also consisting of 32 persons, which met during the 1970-1971 school year. Three of the persons on the latter body were non-public school representatives.

The minutes indicate that the two planning groups held six sessions between the dates of December 22, 1969 and November 12, 1970. These meetings were attended by from 10 to 23 persons. In two of these sessions, one non-public school representative was present; in three sessions, two non-public school representatives were present. Three such representatives also attended one session.

All of the principals of the non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in program planning. All of the respondents reported that they had been invited to participate and had done so. One respondent noted that the three principals of non-public schools had met as a group on at least three occasions to discuss common needs.

It would appear, then, that non-public school participation in this District took the form of both direct attendance at meetings of the planning group, and indirect participation via a representative to the planning group operating under instruction from the principals. The non-public schools were apparently adequately represented in the planning process.

Z. DISTRICT 29

Only one non-public elementary school was designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 29. A sum of $13,593 was allocated for non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee that held six meetings during the period from June 18, 1970, through August 4, 1970. The specific membership of the Committee was not given. It would appear, however, from letters of invitation that were made available to the evaluation team, that the principal of the one non-public school in the District was considered a member of the Advisory Committee.

Some disagreement may be noted in the information supplied by the District Title I Coordinator concerning non-public school participation in planning and the responses to a questionnaire directed to the principal of the non-public school covering the same ground. The District Title I Coordinator reports that invitations to attend all six meetings of the Advisory Committee were sent to the principal of the non-public school, but that no representative was sent to these meetings. The principal reports that invitations to three of these meetings were received after the meeting date, and that she attended two other meetings in person. Both respondents report that a meeting was held between the Title I Coordinator and the principal of the non-public school to discuss proposals.

Evidently, there was moderate participation in the planning process on the part of the representative of the non-public school in this District.

AA. DISTRICT 30

Two non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 30. The total amount allocated for non-public school programs in the District was $37,621.

The request for funding submitted by the District gave no information concerning the process for program planning. A letter from the District Title I Coordinator indicates that a preliminary meeting of a Title I Advisory Committee, attended by representatives of the two non-public schools in the District, was held in June, 1970. This meeting was followed by an August session devoted solely to planning of non-public school programs; this August meeting was attended by the principals of the two schools and District personnel. Following this joint session, private planning sessions were held with the principals of the two schools to develop a specific program for the school in question.

Responses to a questionnaire directed to the principals of the two non-public schools regarding their participation in program planning confirm the reports of the District Title I Coordinator. Evidently, there was adequate participation on the part of the non-public schools in this District.

BB. DISTRICT 31

Six non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in District 31. A sum of $75,580 was allocated for non-public school programs.

The request for funding submitted by the District indicated that Title I programs were planned with the assistance of an Advisory Committee consisting of 39 persons, nine of whom were representatives of the non-public schools. This Advisory Committee held meetings "over a period of many months." No details are given concerning specific dates of meetings nor of attendance of non-public school representatives. No reply was received to a letter to the District Coordinator of State and

Federal Programs requesting additional details.

Four of the six principals of the non-public schools in the District, as well as the District representatives of the non-public schools, responded to a questionnaire concerning their participation in program planning. Four of the respondents indicated that they had attended 12 sessions of the Advisory Committee; the fifth respondent had attended seven such meetings. Evidently, there was considerable participation in the planning process on the part of representatives of the non-public schools in the District.

CC. SUMMARY

In general, the pattern of participation in Title I program planning on the part of representatives of the non-public school presented a far more positive picture than that noted in the 1969-1970 school year. Participation in planning took three forms: (a) direct participation in the deliberations of the District planning group on the part of the principals of the non-public schools in that District, or (b) indirect participation in the work of the District planning group via a representative who transmitted the thinking of the principals of non-public schools who met as a subgroup, or (c) direct planning for an individual non-public school through meetings of the school principal and District personnel on a one-to one basis. In several districts, two of these approaches were utilized.

Apparently, considerable effort was made to involve non-public school principals in planning. Of the 129 principals of non-public schools (75.0% of the total group) who responded to a direct question asking whether they had been invited to attend planning sessions, only 20 (15.5%) responded in the negative. The others all reported that they had either received an invitation to attend or had been represented by a designee.

It is interesting to note that, in 11 Districts, the non-public school principals opted for a single representative to the District Advisory Committee. This approach was far more common during the current school year than during the 1969-1970 school year. Moreover, instances in which principals of non-public schools voiced complaints concerning lack of an invitation to attend planning sessions were far less frequent.

CHAPTER IV

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS

The sections that follow present a brief description of the programs permitting non-public school participation that were organized by the several Districts, and indicate the extent of non-public school participation in these programs. Data concerning participation was gathered through interviews with and questionnaires to Title I Coordinators in the Districts, through interviews with and questionnaires to non-public school liaison personnel in a number of Districts, and through questionnaires to principals of eligible non-public schools in the District.

A. DISTRICT 1

Four of the programs organized by the District permitted participation of non-public school pupils:

1. A "STAR" program, designed to provide supplementary teaching assistance in reading, was to involve pupils of five of the non-public schools in the district. Trained Reading Aides, many of them bilingual, were to teach parents how to help their children who were in the beginning reading program of the schools and who had been diagnosed as potential retardates in reading.
2. A "Homework Helper" program designed to serve pupils in grades 4-6 of eight non-public schools in the District. Children who were retarded in reading were to be tutored by high school students, working under the supervision of a licensed teacher and teacher aides.
3. An "After Schools Centers Trip-Program" involved non-public school pupils who attended the District After School Centers. The program was designed to provide for Saturday bus trips to places of interest outside New York City.

4. A "Non-Public School Program" called for the assignment of two paraprofessionals to each of the nine eligible non-public schools in the District to serve as educational assistants under the direction of centrally assigned Title I teachers. These educational assistants each were to serve a total of $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours per week. The program was to run from December 1, 1970 through June 30, 1971.

The first three of these programs provided for joint participation of public and non-public school children, and became operative early in the school year. The fourth program did not become operative until much later in the school year.

Eight of the nine non-public school principals in the District replied to a questionnaire dealing with participation in the first three programs (those open to both public and non-public school children) noted above. Three of these seven principals reported that they did not know that they were eligible for participation in these programs, and that they had not been invited to participate in them. Five principals reported that they had been invited to participate in programs; in four instances, the invitation had been extended by the principal of the school in which the program was operated.

Two of the principals reported that they were cognizant of their eligibility to participate in the three programs. One of these principals indicated that "we're still waiting for the programs, which are slow in coming;" the other reported participation only in the STAR program, indicating that parental objection made it impossible to place children in the Homework Helper or After School Center programs.

One principal reported that she knew that her school was eligible to participate in the STAR program and the Homework Helper program; she disclaimed knowledge of eligibility to participate in the After School Center program. A total of approximately 15-20 children were reported as participants in the Homework Helper program. The principal indicated that participation would have been higher had the Homework Helper program "been conducted in the pupils' own school, with personnel with whom they were familiar."

Two additional principals reported that they had been informed only of their eligibility to participate in the Homework Helper program, and not in the other two. One of these principals elected not to participate; the other reported participation of some 25-30 pupils, with excellent results.

It is quite evident, insofar as the three programs open to both public and non-public school pupils are concerned, that participation of the latter group was minimal. A substantial number of non-public school pupils were involved only in the Homework Helper Program, and only two of the six principals who were aware that they were eligible to participate in this program actually elected to do so.

Details concerning participation in the one program that was open only to non-public school pupils will be presented in the following chapter of this report.

B. DISTRICT 2

Two of the programs organized and administered by this District permitted participation of non-public school children:

1. "Pilot Schools in the Home" was open to both public and non-public schools, and called for the involvement of ten children enrolled in the non-public schools in the District. The program was designed to help children in grades 1 through 3 who were experiencing difficulties in school and who were members of problem families by working with parents

on familial and educational problems. The staff consisted of a licensed teacher and five family assistants.

2. The "Non-Public School Component" consisted of a variety of programs designed to serve children in the fifteen eligible non-public elementary schools in the District.

a) A "Library Teacher" program was to assign a teacher one day a week to each of the schools to work with children referred by the Title I corrective reading teacher in the school.

b) A psychologist was to be assigned to each school one day a week.

c) A guidance counselor was to be assigned to each school one day a week.

d) A bilingual teacher was to be assigned full time to each of four non-public schools.

e) A total of eighteen educational assistants was to be assigned to nine schools, the number for each school varying with the population of the school. The aides were to work under the supervision of the corrective reading teachers in the schools.

f) A bus trip program was to be organized in one school for children for whom English is a second language.

g) A homework helper program was to be established in one school providing one licensed teacher and 10 student tutors.

Thirteen of the sixteen principals of the non-public schools eligible for participation in the decentralized programs organized by the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their involvement in the Pilot Schools in the Home program. All of these principals reported that they had not been informed of their eligibility to participate in this program, and that they had not been invited to participate. It is evident that this program did not reach the non-public schools.

Details concerning participation in the several elements of the Non-Public School Component will be presented in the following chapter of this report.

C. DISTRICT 3

Only one District - administered project involved participation of non-public school pupils. A "Parent Teacher Teams" program provided teacher aides or educational assistants to each of the nine eligible non-public schools in the District. These paraprofessionals were to work with small groups or individuals under the supervision of a licensed teacher. Preservice and in-service training were to be provided by an Auxiliary Trainer.

Eight of the 10 principals of eligible non-public schools were asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning the extent of their involvement in this program. All eight indicated that they were aware of their eligibility to participate, and that they had been invited to participate, either by the District Title I Coordinator, or by the non-public school representative. Six of the eight respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they had elected to participate in the program; in one case, the paraprofessional assigned proved to be unsatisfactory and a replacement was not hired. The other four principals all stated that the program was of great value: "Our paraprofessionals are making an important contribution to the growth of children..." "It is very good for our children...They have set up a good rapport with paraprofessionals." "The parent-teacher is very helpful in many aspects of the school program."

D. DISTRICT 4

Only one program organized and administered by the District provided for participation of non-public schools. The Therapeutic Program for

Non-Public School was designed to serve pupils for whom English is a second language; teachers of English as a Second Language, educational assistants, family assistants, and family workers were assigned to each of the eight eligible non-public schools.

Six of the eight principals of eligible non-public schools responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement in this program; two of the respondents indicated that they had no knowledge that they were eligible to participate and that they had not been invited to do so. One principal indicated that she had elected not to participate. Of the three principals who indicated that pupils were enrolled in the program, one reported that the program reached 32 pupils, another indicated that 41 pupils were involved, and the third indicated that 120 pupils were serviced; the fourth reported that 202 pupils were involved. All four principals noted that many more pupils could be helped by the program if additional personnel were available.

It would appear, then, that this program was moderately successful in involving non-public school pupils. A complete evaluation of this program is presented in a publication entitled "Group D - Teaching of English as a Second Language," prepared by the Institute for Research and Evaluation.

E. DISTRICT 5

One program organized and administered by the District involved participation of non-public school pupils. A "Non-Public School" program assigned 21 paraprofessionals to seven eligible non-public schools in the District to assist licensed Title I remedial teachers. Details concerning participation in this program will be presented in the following chapter of this report.

F. DISTRICT 6

Only one District administered program involved participation of non-public school pupils; A "Program for Non-Public Schools" provided remedial services to pupils of grades 4, 5, 6 in the six eligible non-public schools in the District. Educational assistants and family workers were to assist Title I remedial teachers. Details concerning participation in this program are presented in the following chapter of this report.

G. DISTRICT 7

Three programs permitting participation by pupils of non-public schools were organized by District 7:

1. "Education Action Through Performing Arts" provided workshop classes in dance, drama, art, and music during afternoons 3:30 - 5:30 and Saturdays, 10 - 4.

2. An "Indoor Winter Sports" program consisted of the organization of competing basketball teams in the District evening centers. Participants included pupils from day schools in the District, public and non-public.

3. A "Program for Non-Public School Students" assigned paraprofessionals to assist Title I remedial teachers in the ten eligible non-public schools in the District.

Some of the principals of the eleven eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning their involvement in the Performing Arts, and Indoor Sports programs, which were open to both public and non-public school pupils. Four of these principals indicated that they did not know that they were eligible to participate in these programs and that they had not been invited to participate. Suidently, participation on the part of non-public school pupils was minimal. One principal indicated that only eight pupils drawn from her school were involved in the two programs, another noted that approximately 25 pupils were enrolled. The third principal reported that she had announced the availability of the programs to her pupils, but had not promoted attendance.

District 7 is one of the Districts that opted to have its decentralized programs evaluated by an agency other than the Central Board of Education. Greater detail concerning these two programs and the third "Program for Non-Public School Students" are given in the report prepared by that agency.

H. DISTRICT 8

Only one program, organized and administered by the District, involved non-public school participation: "Educational Assistants for Non-Public Schools." The program provided educational assistants to aid the Title I remedial teacher in one of the non-public schools in the District. The other non-public school in the District elected not to participate in the program, although the principal had been given an opportunity to do so. The school that did accept paraprofessional assistance reported that the program was of great value.

I. DISTRICT 9

One program involving non-public school participation, was organized and administered by District 9: "Bilingual Component - Non-Public Schools." Five eligible non-public schools participated. The program provided a team of three: a bilingual teacher, an educational assistant, and a family assistant, to each school to help pupil adjustment.

Four of the principals of the five eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement in this program. All of these respondents indicated that the program was, or had been, in operation in their schools. One principal reported that the bilingual teacher who had been employed proved to be inadequate, and had been dismissed. Varying numbers of children, from 20 to 100, were reached in those schools in which the program remained operative. Principals judged the quality of the program as "good" or "excellent."

An evaluation of this program is presented in a publication entitled: "Group D - Teaching of English as a Second Language," prepared by the Institute for Research and Evaluation.

J. DISTRICT 10

The District organized and administered one program involving non-public schools: "Bilingual Educational Assistants in Non-Public Schools." Three bilingual educational assistants were recruited to work with the licensed Title I remedial reading and remedial mathematics teachers in the two eligible non-public schools.

In response to a questionnaire, the principals of both schools reported that they were participating in the program, which was directed to 50 children in one school and more than 200 in the other. Both principals felt that the program was very successful.

A complete evaluation of this program is presented in a publication entitled: "Group D - Teaching English as a Second Language," prepared by the Institute for Research and Evaluation.

K. DISTRICT 12

One program providing for participation of non-public schools, was organized and administered by District 12: "Non-Public Schools." The four eligible non-public schools were provided with bi-lingual teachers, educational assistants, and family assistants to help the pupils for whom English is a second language, improve their educational and personal adjustment.

Only one of the four principals of eligible non-public schools in this District responded to a questionnaire concerning participation in this program. This principal indicated that she had no knowledge that she was eligible for participation in the program, and had not been invited to do so.

District 12 is one of the Districts that elected to have its decentralized programs evaluated by an agency other than the Central Board of Education. Greater detail concerning this program is given in the report prepared by the agency selected.

L. DISTRICT 13

One program, organized and administered by the District, involved participation by pupils of the non-public schools: "Educational Assistants for Reinforcement of the District 13 Reading Program." This program provided nine corrective reading teachers (full time) and nine educational assistants (full time) to the nine eligible non-public schools in the district. The educational assistants worked under the supervision of the corrective reading teachers and also served as liaison between school and home.

District 13 also was one of the Districts that opted for evaluation by an agency other than the Central Board of Education, and details concerning the operation of this program are given in the report prepared by that agency.

M. DISTRICT 14

Six programs that involved non-public schools were organized by District 14; five were "shared" programs; one served non-public schools only.

1. "Evening Community Centers" at two public school sites, three evenings a week for public and non-public school pupils.
2. "Students and Urban Society," a program for selected 8th grade pupils meeting twice a week, 3:00 to 5:00 P.M. in five centers to study the community, to write articles, and to produce films to be incorporated in the social studies curricula. In each center, the staff consisted of a supervisor of social studies, a teacher of social studies, and an educational assistant.
3. "Adaptive Physical Education" involved modified physical activities for children with specific handicaps.
4. "Study Club," a program at Jackson Street Settlement House which provided space for tutors serving as homework helpers.
5. "Young Audiences" provided live musical programs to class groups of children in public school auditoriums. Children from neighboring non-public schools were invited to attend.
6. "Homework Helper Program" operated in 7 eligible non-public schools from 3:00 to 4:30 P.M. Each center was staffed by a teacher and 10 student tutors.

Thirteen of the principals of the 22 eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement in these programs. All thirteen indicated that they had been apprised of their eligibility to participate and that they had been invited to do so by either the District Title I Coordinator or the Program Coordinator, or, in some instances, by District non-public school representative.

Non-public school pupil participation in these programs was generally low, with the exception of the Young Audiences program. In four instances, the non-public school pupils did not participate in any program.

District 14 also opted for evaluation by an agency other than the Central Board of Education. Details concerning the operation of these programs are given in the report prepared by the agency selected by the District.

N. DISTRICT 15

Three of the programs organized and supervised by the District permitted participation of non-public school pupils on a "shared" basis.

1. "Afro-Mediterranean Center" provided a teacher "well-versed in the history and contributions of the area" to develop a center to which District schools might send classes of pupils for observation and discussion.
2. "Saturday and Holiday Bus Trips" provided for planned visits to places of cultural and historical interest.
3. "After-School Study Centers" provided for three afternoon centers with classes in remedial reading, remedial math and the arts. Staff, in each center, consisted of a supervisor, 5 teachers, and 5 educational assistants.

Ten of the principals of the 15 eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement in these three programs. All indicated that they were cognizant of their eligibility to participate, and all but one indicated that they had been invited to do so, generally by the non-public school representative. Two of the principals reported that they elected not to participate in these programs. Only two noted that they were participating in the "Afro-Mediterranean Center," using materials developed by the Center in their classes. Eight of the principals indicated that they planned to participate in the Trip program, which had not yet been made available to them at the time these data were collected (mid-year).

In addition to the programs noted above, the District also organized a Saturday and Holiday Trip Program for Non-Public Schools. This program was scheduled to start operation in February 1971. Evidently, the principals of the non-public schools were not aware of the existence of two trip programs, and did not distinguish between the two in responding to the questionnaire. Details concerning the Trip Program for Non-Public Schools are given in the following chapter of this report.

O. DISTRICT 16

The District administered three programs open to participation by non-public school pupils:

1. "Early Childhood Library" provided for the organization of a reading and audio-visual center operated by a librarian and three library aides. The center was open for use by class groups from eligible public and non-public schools.
2. "Operation Target" provided for a guidance team which accepted referrals of underachievers in grades 7 and 8 in eligible public and non-public schools.
3. "Program for Non-Public Schools" provided for the services of two psychologists, one guidance counselor, and two remedial reading teachers to serve the pupils on referrals, in the eight non-public schools in the District.

Eight of the principals of the nine elementary schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement of their pupils in these programs. Two of the respondents indicated that they were not aware of their eligibility to participate in Operation Target or in the

Program for Non-Public Schools. The other six noted that they had been invited to participate in these programs. All of the eight principals reported that they had been invited to take advantage of the services of the Library Center.

District 16 was also one of the Districts that elected to have its programs evaluated by an agency selected by the District. Details of the operation of these programs are given in the report prepared by that agency.

P. DISTRICT 17

Two District administered projects involved participation of non-public school pupils. The first, a "Homework Helper" program served 45 pupils in grades 1-8 in three non-public schools. A licensed teacher, two educational assistants, and 10 student tutors served each homework helper center. Details concerning the operation of this program are given in the report submitted by the agency selected by the District to evaluate its program.

The second program open to non-public school pupils, "Program for Non-Public School Pupils", provided remediation services in reading to approximately 140 children in three non- public schools. An evaluation of this program is presented in the following chapter.

Q. DISTRICT 19

Six District programs were available to pupils of non-public schools:

1. "After School Learning Center" was a program which was designed to involve 2,000 children, including a possible 260 from non-public schools.
2. "District Band" involved musical instruction and performances for pupils in grades 4-6 for a potential group of 470 pupils, including 50 from non-public schools.

3. "Young Audiences" provided live musical program to class groups of children in auditoriums in public schools. Classes in nearby non-public schools were invited on a "space-available" basis.

4. "Science Ventures" was an after-school program for a possible 240 children including 30 from non-public schools.

5. "Operation Enterprise" provided for small group instruction in business fields for a possible 510 children, including 60 from non-public schools.

6. "Paraprofessional Supportive Services in Non-Public Schools" assigned paraprofessionals to work with Title I remedial teachers in four non-public schools. This program began in February.

Three of the principals of the four eligible non-public schools in the District responded to a questionnaire concerning involvement in these programs. All of the respondents indicated that they were cognizant of their eligibility to participate in these programs. Two of the principals reported that they had been invited to participate in all of the programs; one noted that no invitation had been received to participate in Science Ventures or in Operation Enterprise.

Since District 19 opted to have its programs evaluated by an agency of its own selection, the effectiveness of the first five programs listed above, which involve both public and non-public school participation on a "shared" basis, will be considered in the report submitted by that agency. Details of the operation of the sixth program are given in the following chapter of this report.

B. DISTRICT 21

Only one program administered by the District involved non-public school participation: "Services for Eligible Non-Public Schools. The program provides paraprofessionals to assist Title I remedial teachers of reading, mathematics, speech therapy, guidance, and English as a Second Language in two non-public schools. Details concerning the effectiveness of this program are presented in the following chapter.

S. DISTRICT 23

One District administered program was available to the single non public school: "Non-Public School Component." The program involved the employment of a teacher of English as a Second Language to work with a group of non-English speaking pupils in grades 1-6.

Response to a questionnaire concerning involvement in this program directed to the principal of the non-public school indicated that the program was in operation in the school, and that the program was "very effective."

T. DISTRICT 24

One District administered program was organized: "Non-Public School Component." This component provided an educational assistant to assist the Title I remedial teacher at one non-public school in the District.

Here, too, response to a questionnaire indicated that the program "benefits many of our children." A more detailed evaluation of this program is given in the report prepared by the evaluation agency selected by the District.

U. DISTRICT 28

Three programs permitting participation of non-public school pupils were organized in District 28:

1. "Special Primary Program" was a variation of the All Day Neighborhood Schools program operated chiefly for public school pupils; non-public school pupils participated in only one facet of the program - the

After School Center.

2. "P.S. 40 Enrichment Program" was a "shared" public and non-public school program. Pupils of non-public schools were permitted to participate in one part of the program involving Saturday trips to space exhibits and aerospace industries.

3. "Self Motivation Institute P.S. 50" was an after school science and cultural enrichment program. Children were encouraged to develop their own scientific projects and perform laboratory experiments. They were introduced to dramatics in class and in visits to theatres; to music by singing and using musical instruments.

All three of the principals of eligible non-public schools in the District reported that they were informed about, and had been invited to participate in, the Special Primary Program, but that they were not informed about the programs at P.S. 40 and P.S. 50. They all were permitted to enroll in the Special Primary Program.

Details concerning these programs are given in the report submitted by the agency selected as the evaluator by the District.

V. DISTRICT 29

One District administered program was available for pupils of the one eligible non-public school in the district: "Non-Public School Program." The program provided a corrective reading teacher and a school aide to work with 160 pupils at the non-public school. The district reading consultant supervised the program.

The principal of the non-public school, in response to a questionnaire, indicated that the program was serving approximately 150 children. Details concerning this program are reported in the following chapter.

W. DISTRICT 30

One District administered program was available for pupils in eligible non-public schools: "Remedial Program for Non-Public Schools." The program utilized the services of a corrective mathematics teacher and two educational assistants.

Details concerning the operation of this program are presented in the following chapter.

X. DISTRICT 31

The District organized one program for pupils of non-public schools: "Non-Public School Program." The program is a corrective reading program in all six eligible non-public schools in the district.

Details concerning the operation of this program are presented in the following chapter.

Y. SUMMARY

Although there was greater participation in the planning process on the part of the representatives of the non-public schools during the current year than during the 1969-1970 school year, actual participation in the programs that were organized left much to be desired. To begin with, 30 (17.4%) of the 172 principals of eligible non-public schools, in respons to a questionnaire, indicated that they had not been invited to participate in one or more of the programs permitting involvement of non-public schools that had been organized by the Districts in which their schools were locate Indeed, 28 (16.3%) of these 172 principals indicated that they had not even been informed that their schools were eligible to participate in these programs. What makes these data even more disturbing is the fact that only 83 (48.3%) of the 172 principals replied to the questionnaire. Thus, in actuality, one-third of the non-public school principals who replied to the questionnaire disclaimed any knowledge that their schools were eligible to participate in one or more of the decentralized programs that were developed

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF SELECTED PROGRAMS

A. DISTRICT 1 - "NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM"

This program provided for the assignment of two paraprofessionals to each of the nine eligible non-public schools in District 1 to serve as educational assistants under the direction of centrally assigned Title I teachers. The proposal called for the educational assistants to serve $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours per day, five days per week, from December 1, 1970 through June 30, 1971.

1. Program Objectives

a. To improve the academic achievement of educationally retarded children.

b. To maintain positive attitudes toward self and school among participating pupils.

2. Evaluation Procedures

A variety of approaches were utilized in the evaluation of this program:

a. Observation of the program - periodic visits were made to program sites to note implementation of the program.

b. Interviews with paraprofessionals, Title I and non-public school teachers, school administrators, and the program coordinator.

c. Analysis of rating scale data.

d. Analysis of records.

3. Program Implementation

Staff. The Title I coordinator for District I served as the Project Coordinator, but the elected non-public school representative, in conjunction with the Project Coordinator, was immediately involved in the implementation and activities of the program.

The program was scheduled to run from December 1,1970 through June 30, 1971, but the Project Coordinator was not notified that this proposal had been approved until the beginning of January. Accordingly, many of the paraprofessionals did not begin in the schools until the middle of January or the beginning of February.

The personnel were assigned and found to be operating as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PARAPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN THE ELIGIBLE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

LOCATION	PARAPROFESSIONALS
School A	2
B	2
C	2
D	2
E	2
F	3
G	3
H	2
	18

The proposal had provided for two paraprofessionals to be assigned to each of the nine eligible non-public schools in the District. One eligible school opted not to participate in the program, and the non-public school representative assigned two additional paraprofessionals to two other participating schools. One of these paraprofessionals was assigned to School F and the other to School G.

Activities. The non-public school representative coordinated the activities of the project and served as a resource person to the participating schools as well as liaison to District Headquarters. Each principal of the eight participating schools served as school coordinator for the program and recruited, hired and supervised his own paraprofessionals. Each school utilized the paraprofessionals according to its own needs and little inter-school communication concerning the program was evident.

An in-service training program, consisting of six three hour sessions, was provided by the District for the paraprofessionals. The emphasis of these training sessions centered around providing the paraprofessional with the basic information and skills for assisting children, grades one through four, in learning reading and mathematics skills. The sessions included human relations skills: problem solving through discussion and role playing.

Activities, School A. The two paraprofessionals in School A began the program in the beginning of January. They assisted the Title I teachers when needed and spent the remainder of their time giving extra help in reading and mathematics to those children identified by the classroom teachers of the first six grades. They worked with approximately 30 children on both an individual and group basis. At times, they worked in the classrooms assisting the classroom teacher. Most of the paraprofessionals' activities involved the strengthening of reading skills of those children who had been identified as needing extra help by either the classroom or Title I teacher.

The paraprofessionals worked under the direct supervision of the principal. One paraprofessional was observed in the school's office answering phone calls and assisting in school related tasks. Both paraprofessionals were observed reading stories, relating concepts and explaining vocabulary words to small groups of youngsters on different grade levels.

Activities, School B. The two paraprofessionals assigned to this school began their program during the first week of February. One paraprofessional was assigned by the principal to work with the first grade and the other paraprofessional was assigned to work with the second and third grades. They took those children identified by the teacher as needing help in reading out of the classroom and worked with them both individually and in groups. Three groups of children met with the paraprofessional for a half hour each day building reading skills and vocabulary. Flash cards and word workbooks were utilized throughout the program at this school.

Activities, School C. The two paraprofessionals in this school were assigned by the principal to work with children in the first four grades. They started the program during the last week of January and have worked with approximately twenty children who needed help in reading as identified by the classroom teacher. One paraprofessional worked with grades one and two and the other worked with grades three and four. Most of the children were seen every day for reading exercises and reading workbook help. Records of student improvement were kept.

Activities, School D. The two paraprofessionals assigned to School D started in the program during the first week of February. They were respectively assigned to work in the classroom with the first grade and second grade teachers by the principal. Both paraprofessionals assisted approximately 80 first and second graders in mathematics, phonics and vocabulary skills. The paraprofessionals worked with both individuals and groups of children in the classroom. They kept lists of those children who needed help as identified by the classroom teacher. Individual flash cards were constructed for the children to use. Academically retarded children in reading were given a reading lesson each day.

Both paraprofessionals also assisted the reading teachers with groups of fourth and fifth graders for one hour each day.

Activities, School E. One paraprofessional began the program during the second week of February and the other began during the beginning of April in School E. The principal assigned each of them to work with a specific teacher. One paraprofessional worked in a combined third and fourth grade classroom. The paraprofessional helped those children who were doing poorly in English and mathematics on an individual basis in the classroom while the teacher worked with other children. The other paraprofessional worked with those students who were slow in reading and mathematics comprehension. In addition, the paraprofessional checked the students' homework assignments for completion on a daily basis. Approximately 40 children participated in the program in the school. The paraprofessionals started their school day at 9:15 A.M., which was during the time that the Hebrew Speaking session of the school was in operation. From 9:15 A.M. to 11:30 A.M. they helped the teachers with the Hebrew classes and have taken over classes when a Hebrew teacher was absent. They assisted the children on all grade levels with the Hebrew alphabet and translations.

Activities, School F. Three paraprofessionals at School F were assigned to work with grades two through four by the principal. Approximately 55 children were serviced by the program. Two of the paraprofessionals helped those children who were poor in reading skills with phonics, SRA cards and reading exercises. The teachers had identified these children for the paraprofessionals; the Title I reading teacher did not have enough time during her two visits a week to assist all of these children. The third paraprofessional gave mathematics help to third and fourth graders. This paraprofessional worked with those students who were in need of help as identified by the classroom teacher and the Title I remedial mathematics teacher.

All three paraprofessionals worked with individuals and groups of students. The program began during the last week of January.

Activities, School G. Approximately 40 students were involved in the program at School G. Three paraprofessionals were assigned by the principal to work with those students who had been identified by the classroom teacher as needing remediation in mathematics and reading. Two of the paraprofessionals began the program at the end of January. One of these worked with grades two and three and the other with grades four and five. Extra help was given to both individual and groups of children. The third started in early March. This paraprofessional conducted Spanish lessons for groups of students in grades two through seven; each group met two times per week. In the groups, Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish speaking youngsters were paired to help each other learn their respective languages. The children in the groups observed were quite enthusiastic about this learning experience.

Activities, School H. The two paraprofessionals assigned to school H began after the second week in February; approximately 30 children were involved in the program. One paraprofessional worked with second, third and fourth graders and the other with fifth, sixth and seventh graders. Those teachers who felt that particular students or small groups of students needed remediation in mathematics or reading sent those youngsters to the paraprofessionals. These children worked with the paraprofessionals for 45 minute periods.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING INDICATED IMPROVEMENT IN ACADEMIC AREAS

		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very Poor	
School	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	31	12	38.7	10	32.3	9	29.0				
B	20	1	5.0	7	35.0	6	30.0	4	20.0	2	10.0
C	20	1	5.0	6	30.0	10	50.0	3	15.0		
D	80	14	17.5	53	66.3	11	13.8	1	1.3	1	1.3
E	39	4	10.3	20	51.3	10	25.1	3	8.2	2	5.1
F	56	16	28.6	28	50.0	10	17.9	2	3.6		
G	40	4	10.0	20	50.0	15	37.5	1	2.5		
H	28	3	10.7	8	28.5	16	57.1	1	3.6		
Total	314	55	17.5	152	48.5	87	27.7	14	4.5	5	1.6

Using the rather stringent criterion of "excellent" or "good" progress, more than 70 per cent of the pupils in three schools (A,D,F) achieved such ratings, unusually fine performance in a program of this type. For the schools taken as a group, 66 per cent of the pupils were judged to have made better than average progress, while 93.7 per cent were judged to have made at least acceptable progress. In view of the short period of time in which the program operated, this must be considered very good performance.

In addition to these teacher ratings of academic improvement, changes in pupil attitude to self and school were also rated. Here, too, a five point scale was utilized:

1. Shows a markedly more positive attitude
2. Shows a moderately more positive attitude
3. Has shown no change in attitude
4. Shows a moderately more negative attitude
5. Shows a markedly more negative attitude.

A summary of the proportion of pupils in each school showing a positive change in attitude on each item of the scales to measure attitudes to self and school is presented in Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 4

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING POSITIVE CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TO SELF

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F	School G	School H
Happy & relaxed	94.7	100.0	81.8	47.6	100.0	70.3	82.0	28.5
Tries new things	88.8	100.0	75.0	48.2	100.0	59.3	89.7	35.7
Works independently	78.9	90.0	70.0	58.4	77.7	42.1	56.4	23.0
Gets along with others	94.1	100.0	92.3	43.1	100.0	52.3	82.0	46.4
Confident in abilities	80.0	89.4	73.6	66.6	100.0	61.9	71.7	39.2
Dress & appearance	75.0	85.7	76.9	17.3		33.3	79.4	32.0
Pride in work	90.0	94.1	65.0	62.5	100.0	54.8	71.7	42.8
Friendly and outgoing	94.1	100.0	84.6	25.5	100.0	66.6	92.3	39.2
Reacts well to frustration	100.0	100.0	70.5	47.3	100.0	68.9	66.6	32.1
Leadership qualities	53.8	100.0	66.6	31.2		26.3	51.2	14.8

TABLE 5

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING POSITIVE CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TO SCHOOL

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F	School G	School H
Cooperates	100.0	90.0	75.0	53.5	100.0	58.5	64.1	22.2
Accepts assistance & criticism	100.0	100.0	94.7	55.7	95.8	56.2	84.6	29.6
Completes work	94.4	90.0	82.3	52.7	100.0	62.8	66.6	22.2
Attends regularly	81.8	94.7	93.3	14.6			84.6	16.0
Controls behavior	100.0	88.8	91.6	40.3	100.0	58.3	92.3	4.3
Shows courtesy	100.0	88.8	92.8	43.1	100.0	100.0	87.1	40.7
Adjusts to limitations	90.0	100.0	73.3	52.8	100.0	52.3	71.7	17.3
Pays attention	85.7	90.0	83.3	57.1	100.0	69.5	66.6	33.3
Gains satisfaction from work	94.7	100.0	61.1	74.3	100.0	70.4	87.1	33.3
Participates in class	85.6	100.0	60.0	61.2	100.0	62.0	69.2	25.9

While it is true that these rating scales have the weaknesses that are characteristic of all such scales, they are apparently sensitive enough to differences among schools. Thus, Schools A, B, and F were apparently markedly successful in developing positive attitudes to self and school, while Schools D and H were not.

5. Major Strengths of the Program

The strengths of the program included the following:

1. The recruitment of a generally strong staff of paraprofessionals from the local community by each school.

2. Professional responsibility and commitment for children was exemplified by principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

3. Willingness of the paraprofessionals to reach out to help those children who needed remediation services.

4. Having remediation personnel in the schools on a full-time basis, while the Title 1 teachers were usually assigned on a one day per week basis.

5. The opportunity for inservice training for the paraprofessionals through the Auxiliary Career Program sponsored by the Community School District.

6. Major Weaknesses of the Program

The major limitations, as noted by the observer, included the following:

1. The shortness of the program, primarily due to the late notification that the proposal had been approved. This fact must be considered as a contributing factor in the program's failure to achieve its objectives fully.

2. Lack of appropriate district level leadership and support.

3. Immediate administration and supervision of the program was carried out at minimum levels.

4. Lack of information to the schools concerning the nature of the proposal and its stated objectives.

5. Lack of coordination between the activities of the paraprofessional and the Title I teachers.

7. Recommendations

This program, as developed in the non-public schools in District 1 seeks to provide for a major need of the non-public school pupils for additional service. In general, in spite of some limitations and unevenness of development in the several non-public schools in the District, the program has succeeded in meeting its objectives in large part, and merits recycling. Some suggestions are advanced for consideration by the District.

1. Programs such as this must be organized early in the school year, and schools should be notified in ample time to organize an effective program. This implies that there will be appropriate leadership and support for non-public school programs on the District level, and district communication with non-public school representative and school principals during planning and implementation of the program for the non-public schools.

2. A larger measure of supervision of the activities of the paraprofessionals assigned to the schools is needed. One should not expect the District Title I coordinator to serve as project coordinator; a project coordinator, who would undertake direct observation of paraprofessionals, should be appointed.

3. Program implementation should be the joint responsibility of the project coordinator and the non-public school representative.

B. DISTRICT 2 - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT

The original description of the Non-Public School Component consisted of the following elements:

a. Three Library teachers were to be recruited and assigned, one day a week, to each of the fifteen eligible elementary schools in the district to utilize the resources of the school library and to conduct a program of remediation, working with individual and small groups of children.

b. Three School Psychologists were to be recruited and assigned, one day a week, to each of the fifteen eligible elementary schools in the district "to help staff work together, to help them meet the needs of individual students, to help staff work well with parents, to help parents improve their relationships with children, and to help bring parents and community resources into closer contact."

c) Four Bilingual Teachers were to be recruited and assigned, one to each of four schools, full time,"to work in conjunction with classroom teachers and guidance counselors,""to identify 120 children per school as the target groups using as criteria the ability to speak English, academic retardation, and evidence of emotional problems." The Bilingual Teachers were to "establish workshops for parents, interview parents and children, make home visits, and act as liaison between pupils, parents and other school personnel."

d) A Guidance Counselor was to be recruited and assigned, one day a week, to each of five schools. The guidance Counselor's concern was to be "any problem that obstructs the child's ability to realize the fullest potential of his school experience." The counselor was to make referrals and assist in follow up procedures."

e) An Educational Development Laboratory Program was to be established in one classroom at one non-public school "to provide for a highly individualized approach to diagnoses and remediation through the use of the controlled reader," with unifying equipment, materials, and supplies, for 60 children identified by classroom teachers, guidance counselors, and corrective reading teachers. In addition to the program learning and workbook materials, films, filmstrips and classroom supplies, the following equipment - Aud X Mark 2 Controlled Reader, Jac Box Headsets, Reader Case, CR Processing Motor Toch - x aperture plates, 500 watt dust covers, Flash X, and a table-top projection screen were to be provided.

f) In one school, Program Learning and workbook materials were to be made available to be used by the Corrective Reading and Corrective Mathematics teachers.

g) In one school, supplies and materials were to be made available to be used by the Handicapped Reading teacher.

h) Two bus trips for pupils were to be made available to one school, to be utilized by the teacher of English as a Second Language, to "stimulate language learnings."

i) A Homework Helper Program for one school, to provide for one Master Teacher and 10 Student Aides (tutors) to do "individual diagnosis and remedial assistance in all subject areas."

j) An "Educational Task Force" of 18 Educational Assistants "to provide paraprofessional assistance to the classroom teacher to facilitate increased small group and individual work," in nine schools.

1. Program Implementation

The entire program was to function from January 4 to June 30, about two-thirds of the school year. However, the program did not begin as planned since it was not approved by the Title I office of the State Education Department. Consequently, on March 2, 1971, the District Title I Coordinator submitted a modification of the Non-Public School Component, which included a number of changes in the original program:

a) Library Teachers - to serve 7 schools instead of 15.
b) School Psychologists - to serve 9 schools instead of 15.
c) Bilingual Teachers - unchanged.
d) Guidance Counselor - unchanged.
e) Educational Development Laboratory - deleted.
f) Program Learning Materials - deleted.
g) Materials for Handicapped Reading - deleted
h) Two bus trips - deleted
i) Homework Helpers - 5 tutors instead of 10.
j) Educational Task Force - reduced from 18 to 14.

Duration of Program - March 1 instead of January 1, 1971

On March 1, the non-public schools in District 2 faced both a reduction in expected services and duration of the Title I program. Actually the program was not put into effect on March 1. The schools were faced with the necessity to recruit personnel for the program at a time of the school year when personnel was very difficult to obtain. For example,

k) Originally 3 Library Teachers were supposed to be recruited to serve the 15 schools. The modification reduced the 15 schools to be served to 7; actually only 4 schools were served; these 4 schools received service beginning March 16, April 5, May 4 and May 4, respectively.

l) 3 School Psychologists were originally supposed to serve 15 schools: the modification reduced the 15 schools to be served to 9; actually only 4 schools were served. These four schools received service beginning March 8, April 19, April 19, and May 3, respectively.

m) 4 Bilingual Teachers were originally supposed to serve 4 schools; unchanged by the modification. Actually only 3 schools received service; service began on April 19, not March 1.

n) One Guidance Counselor was originally to serve 5 schools, beginning March 1. Actually service began either April 23 or April 30.

o) Educational Task Force was originally to serve 9 schools, and later reduced to 7. All 7 schools were served; initial dates ranged from March 1 to April 30.

All fifteen schools were supposed to receive equipment and supplies to help implement their programs. When the beginning date of the programs was changed from January 4 to March 1, the District requested that the resulting accruals be used for additional equipment and supplies. However, no school received any equipment or supplies on March 1 or thereafter. On April 20, the New York State Education Department Division of Education for the Disadvantaged ruled: "purchase of supplied and equipment have been totally disallowed'since'it is far too late in the semester for items to be delivered and used in a meaningful way during this Academic year."

2. Program Effectiveness

A look at several typical non-public schools in the District yields a realistic picture of the impact of the decentralized programs.

School A. Project register: 71. Library Teacher, one day per week: deleted in modification. School Psychologist, one day per week: unable to recruit. Guidance Counselor, one day per week: assigned as of April 23.

The guidance counselor was well qualified, and had broad experience in working with disadvantaged children, but with only two months to develop operational plans, to get to know teachers and children, and to get to be known and accepted, there was little the guidance counselor could to to help children.

School B. Project Register: 103. Library Teacher, one day per week: deleted, March 2. School Psychologist, one day per week: began service on March 8. Two Educational Assistants: recruited on March 1 and March 8, respectively. Supplies: none received; school has inadequate amount.

Both the school psychologist and the guidance counselor were well qualified and experienced. Unfortunately, long waiting lists for referrals to the two agencies in the community dealing with emotionally disturbed children (Catholic Charities and Roosevelt Hospital) seriously hampered attempts to provide full service to the children.

The educational assistants, adults residing in the community, were selected and supervised by the principal of the school. Observation of their performance indicated that they were knowledgeable and skillful; interviews indicated awareness of function. Both demonstrated excellent rapport with children. Although total time available for work with children was extremely curtailed, classroom teachers report improved performance on the part of the children referred for help.

School C. Project register: 45. Trip program: deleted March 2. Library Teacher, one day per week: deleted, March 2. School Psychologist, one day per week: deleted, March 2. Equipment and supplies for remedial reading and remedial mathematics: not received.

School D. Project register: 30. Library Teacher, one day per week: deleted, March 2. School Psychologist, one day per week: deleted, March 2. Master Teacher, Homework Helper Program: began service March 1.

The Master Teacher, drawn from the staff of the school, was highly qualified and, of course, experienced in working with the children comprising the population to be served. Planning for student aides was very well done. The five student aides, a reduction from the original 10, were recruited from the secondary department of the school. Orientation and supervision were provided by the Master Teacher. Observation of tutoring sessions gave evidence of excellent planning; the student aides came to the session very well-prepared. Their approach to the pupils was sympathetic, yet firm. Interviews were conducted with the classroom teachers of a random sample of 12 pupils in the Homework Helper group. Only one teacher reported that the pupil involved had shown no improvement. The others indicated that they had noted a marked improvement in attitude to school, in ability to recite in class, in development of study skills. Several noted that their pupils had been helped to overcome fears. Many, too, observed that the pupils were eager to attend the tutoring session.

3. Summary

In the light of the delays in mounting the program, and of the reduction in the program that had been planned, it is not surprising that only two of the 15 elementary school principals that were interviewed expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the operation of the Non-Public School Component. Five of the other principals expressed partial satisfaction with the program. Each of these principals welcomed the paraprofessional assistance that was provided, even for the relatively short time that such help was available. The remaining eight principals were highly critical. Discontent centered about the marked delays in initiating the program, the resulting difficulty in recruitment of personnel, and the brief duration of the program. The failure to receive any materials, after investing considerable time and effort in selection, plus the difficulty in mounting a remedial program without these materials, aroused resentment and concern. The inability, in view of the short time involved, to utilize some type of pre-test post-test analysis of pupil performance was another source of criticism.

Yet, in spite of these criticisms, highly valid as they are, the program (marked as its implementation was by administrative ineptitude) has potential for the future. Observation of such programs as did succeed in getting under way, reports from classroom teachers and supervisors were uniformly favorable, insofar as performance of personnel was concerned.

4. Recommendations

a. In the light of what happened in the development and implementation of this program, it is recommended that program planning be begun early in the previous school year, and that a firm commitment to a planned program be made in the light of available funds. If necessary, planning should take the form of development of alternative programs, based upon varied sums of money, so that when final allocations are made, it will not be necessary to retool an entire proposal.

b. Delay in purchase of needed supplies and equipment is inexcusable. Provision should be made for early ordering so that materials are available when a program first gets under way, not when it ends. If necessary, present practice in ordering should be changed to permit the local Title I Coordinator to purchase supplies directly, rather than using the purchasing facilities of the central Board of Education.

C. DISTRICT 5 - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENT

The Non-Public School Component in District 5 called for the assignment of 21 teacher aides and/or educational assistants in seven non-public schools. Each of these paraprofessionals was to work 5½ hours per day under the direction of the Title I teacher to whom they were to be assigned. The program began on September 14, 1970 and ended on June 30, 1971.

1. Program Objectives

The objectives of the program were stated as follows:

a. To improve the academic achievement of participating pupils.

b. To develop and maintain positive self-attitudes and attitudes toward school of participating students.

2. Evaluation Procedures

A variety of approaches were utilized in the evaluation of the program developed in the District:

a. Observation. Several visits were made to each of the seven non-public schools by the evaluator. Attention was directed during these visits to the effectiveness of the para-professionals, the relationship of the paraprofessionals to the students and professional staff and the quality of the student participation with the paraprofessional.

b. Interviews. The principals, (who administered the paraprofessional program), the paraprofessionals and the teachers who were participating in the program were interviewed. Basically, the interview was directed to determination of the respondent's perceptions of program strengths and weaknesses.

c. Rating scales. The classroom teachers associated with the program were asked to complete rating scales designed to provide a measure of pupil attitudes to self and school.

d. Analysis of test results. Pre-test and post-test scores on the SRA tests administered by Title I teachers in Mathematics and Reading to children participating in the program were made available for analysis.

3. Program Implementation

The number of paraprofessionals assigned to each school was determined by the size of the school population. At the outset of the program, the principals of the seven non-public schools were advised that the paraprofessionals were restricted to working with the Title I teachers assigned to each school. This rigid requirement did not work out in practice, since the Title I teachers were not present in each school every day and the paraprofessionals were. After two or three months, this ruling was relaxed and the principal was permitted to assign the paraprofessional to work in the classroom, with children who needed help on the days the Title I teachers were not present in the school.

The paraprofessionals were assigned to a wide range of duties: they served as librarians; they assisted children individually and in small groups, both in the classroom and in separate work rooms; they marked papers; they supervised in the lunchroom and play yard; they escorted pupils to the lunchroom, school yard, and toilets; they prepared materials used as teaching aids; they served as office assistants.

The principals made a definite effort to assign paraprofessionals to duties in terms of their educational background and previous experience. It was noted that those paraprofessionals assigned to work with Title I teachers tended to have the more adequate background.

At the outset, the rigidity reflected in the requirement that the paraprofessional work exclusively with the Title I teacher proved to be a major problem in program implementation. When this requirement was relaxed, and the principals were rree to assign the paraprofessionals where they were most needed, the program functioned more effectively.

4. Program Effectiveness

a. Analysis of Test Results. Pre-test and post-test scores on the SRA tests, routinely used by the Title I teachers, were made available to the evaluator in four schools. Some difficulties were experienced in obtaining test results from Title I teachers, since they considered themselves Central Board of Education personnel, and the evaluation was directed to a District program.

A summary of the available test scores is presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Mean Pre-test and Post-test Scores of Participating Students

		Reading			Mathematics	
School	N	Pre-test	Post-test	N	Pre-test	Post-test
A	11	2.86	3.56	11	3.26	3.87
B	94	3.86	4.42	75	4.29	5.38
F	4	2.68	4.33	4	2.83	4.70
G	8	3.85	4.68	8	3.94	4.80
Total	117	3.72	4.36	98	4.05	5.13

For the group as a whole, slightly more than 6 months growth in reading and 11 months growth in mathematics was noted over the time the program was in operation. This growth exceeds the expected "five months growth set to be shown by 70% of the pupils " as a quality indicator. This standard was exceeded in each of the schools for which data were available.

b. Attitudes to Self and School. Classroom teachers were asked to note the improvement shown by their pupils in attitudes to self and school, using the following five-point scale:

1. Shows a markedly more positive attitudes
2. Shows a moderately more positive attitude
3. Has shown no change in attitude
4. Shows a moderately more negative attitude
5. Shows a markedly more negative attitude

A summary of the proportion of pupils in each school showing a positive change in attitude on each item of the scales is presented in Tables 7 and 8.

TABLE 7
Per Cent of Pupils Showing Positive Change in Attitude to Self

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F	School
Happy and relaxed	33.3	73.5	32.0	90.0	66.7	100.0	63.1
Tries new things	31.2	70.5	36.0	90.0	57.1	100.0	68.4
Works independently	39.5	73.5	36.0	80.0	50.0	100.0	42.1
Gets along well with classmates	25.0	71.5	48.0	90.0	64.2	83.3	73.6
Confident in abilities	22.9	70.5	40.0	80.0	41.6	83.3	52.6
Dress; appearance	22.9	69.3	24.0	70.0	73.3	100.0	52.6
Pride in Work	31.2	69.6	40.0	90.0	58.3	83.3	57.8
Friendly; outgoing	31.2	71.5	36.0	60.0	64.2	66.6	73.6
Reacts well to frustration	13.9	68.6	28.0	70.0	61.5	100.0	42.1
Leadership Qualities	13.3	35.0	8.0	45.0	45.4	16.6	21.0

TABLE 8

Per Cent of Pupils Showing Positive Change in Attitude to School

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F	School G
Cooperates	27.0	72.5	28.0	85.0	61.5	83.3	57.1
Accepts assistance and criticism	42.5	72.5	52.0	85.0	42.8	83.3	85.7
Completes work	25.0	70.5	40.0	55.0	45.4	100.0	57.1
Attends regularly	36.1	72.5	28.0	90.0	64.2	100.0	64.2
Controls behavior	34.0	69.3	28.0	70.0	41.6	100.0	78.5
Shows courtesy	35.4	71.5	32.0	95.0	53.3	100.0	78.5
Adjusts to limitations	15.9	71.5	32.0	80.0	53.3	83.3	78.5
Pays Attention	19.5	74.5	36.0	90.0	46.6	100.0	85.7
Gains satisfaction from work	37.5	70.5	24.0	80.0	57.1	100.0	85.7
Participates in Class	24.5	72.0	20.0	80.0	50.0	100.0	64.2

It is very clear that the schools found it very difficult to influence positive changes in attitudes to self and school in the children participating in the program. In general, the program apparently was more successful in inculcating more positive attitudes toward school than toward self. In the latter area, only two schools (School D and School F) approached the level (75% of the pupils will show a more positive attitude) set as an indicator of program effectiveness. In the area of attitudes to school, School G, as well as Schools D and F, approached this level.

C. Observation and Interview Data. The enthusiasm of the paraprofessionals for the work they were doing, and their positive interaction with children was very evident. The paraprofessional needed very little direction in the classroom; She was alert to the children who needed help, who needed to be encouraged, or who needed to be quieted. The children appeared to accept and even welcome the assistance of the paraprofessional, and frequently sought her aid.

Interaction between teacher and paraprofessional varied from class to class. Some teachers spent considerable time in planning for the use of the paraprofessional, coordinating activities in terms of a discussion of plans for lessons. Others simply assigned the paraprofessinnal to duties as the need arose.

Professionals and paraprofessionals alike were uniformily highly positive about the program and its contribution to the pupils. They agreed that the program made it possible to give children the assistance they needed at the moment when it was needed, and not when a teacher was free to attend to their needs. The principals, in particular, noted the advantages that accrued when a member of the community was recruited to work with the children, stressing the resulting improvement in community relations and the positive model the paraprofessional presented to the child.

The evaluator was impressed with the evident involvement of the paraprofessionals, and their desire to improve their skills in order to be of greater help to the children. This desire for greater training on the part of the paraprofessional is a reflection of a major weakness of the program - the lack of a training and orientation program that would serve to familiarize the paraprofessional with the school, the children, the professional personnel with whom she would be working, and her duties and responsibilities. Teachers, too, could use help in techniques of utilization of the services of the paraprofessional.

5. Recommendations

The program in District 5 has demonstrated its effectiveness, and should be recycled for an additional year. Some suggestions are advanced for consideration by the District.

1. Provide an orientation program for professionals, designed to clarify the role of the paraprofessional in the school, and to give training in utilization of paraprofessional services.

2. Provide training for the paraprofessional as to her role with children prior to her assignment to a specific class. Continue such training during the school year via periodic workshops and in-service courses, to give paraprofessionals an opportunity to meet with their peers and share ideas.

3. Provide opportunities for the paraprofessional to participate in the Career Ladder program.

4. Continue the present system of flexible assignment of paraprofessionals in terms of school needs, rather than restricting assignment to classrooms of Title I teachers.

D. DISTRICT 6 - PROGRAM FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The program for Non-public schools in District 6 provided for the services of eight educational assistants and two family workers to help individualized instruction and to improve the pupils' self-image. The educational assistant was to work under the supervision of the Title I teachers. The family worker was to assist the district supervisor of guidance in informing parents and the community of the objectives and progress of the program.

Five of the eleven Non-public schools in District 6 were included in the Decentralized program. The eight paraprofessionals who were to assist in reading and mathematics program were assigned to five of the schools; three paraprofessionals to School A, two to School B and one each to Schools C, D, and E. Of the two family workers assigned by the District, one was assigned to School B and the second to School C. Since the program varied in scope and interpretation in each of the schools, they will be discussed separately.

1. Program Objectives

The stated objectives of the program for District 6 were given as follows:

1. To improve language arts and mathematics abilities among the participants.
2. To improve pupil's self-attitudes.

2. Evaluation Procedures

The procedures utilized in evaluating the program in District 6 paralleled those used in District 5, and included observation, interviews with participating personnel, analysis of rating scale data, and analysis of test results.

3. Program Implementation and Effectiveness

School A

The three paraprofessionals assigned to School A did not assist Title I teachers, but worked autonomously with small remedial groups. Each paraprofessional has from seven to ten students with whom she works on improving reading skills dealing with the students on a one-to-one basis or in small groups.

Observation of the classes in session indicated that the physical facilities were inadequate. The paraprofessionals work in the school auditorium where there is little room for any permanent arrangement for display areas for student work, storage of materials. In addition, there are many disturbing elements. Admittedly, the school does not have other space.

In spite of the difficulties of the physical situation, it was evident that the paraprofessionals were able to relate effectively to the children. In no small measure, the small number of children with whom they worked contributed to their ability to reach the students.

There was little training or supervision accorded to the paraprofessionals. In interviews, the paraprofessionals indicated that they were assigned a group of children with whom to work, but with no accompanying indication of the pupils' reading level or weaknesses. They noted their need for additional training in correction of reading difficulties, and the need for joint planning with the classroom teacher of a work plan for each child.

Materials were in short supply. There was a shortage of working materials for children; audiovisual materials were sparse; a greater variety of materials was needed.

In the light of the poor conditions under which the program functioned, how well did the pupils perform? While it is true that standardized tests were used to gauge pupil growth, the Metropolitan Reading Test was used as a pre-test, and the SRA Reading Test as a post-test. This, of course, makes pre - and post-test comparisons virtually meaningless. For what they are worth, however, the mean pre-test score of a group of 21 pupils for whom data were available was 3.08; the post-test mean was 3.85. Evidently, there was some growth over the period of time spent in the program; considerably less, however, than the growth of one year set as the quality indicator of program effectiveness.

To what extent was the program effective in improving pupil attitudes to self and school? In School A, paraprofessionals and classroom teachers, working cooperatively, completed five-point rating scales designed to provide a measure of improvement in these areas. Data were available for 20 students, and are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 9

Per Cent of Pupils Showing Improvement in Attitudes to Self

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D
Happy and relaxed.	90.0	83.3	80.0	55.0
Tries new things.	85.0	63.3	80.0	20.0
Works independently.	75.0	76.6	60.0	40.0
Gets along with classmates.	70.0	36.7	93.0	45.0
Confident in abilities.	80.0	50.0	13.3	30.0
Dress and appearance.	50.0	50.0	40.0	40.0
Takes pride in work.	95.0	53.3	50.0	25.0
Friendly and outgoing.	75.0	93.3	66.7	50.0
Reacts well to frustration.	45.0	50.0	20.0	40.0
Shows leadership qualities.	35.0	56.7	20.0	20.0

TABLE 10

Per Cent of Pupils Showing Improvement in Attitudes to School

Item	School A	School B	School C	School D
Cooperates with teachers and pupils.	90.0	63.3	50.0	40.0
Accepts teacher assistance and criticism.	100.0	73.3	20.0	40.0
Completes work.	90.0	30.0	13.3	55.0
Attends school regularly.	50.0	53.3	33.3	40.0
Controls inappropriate behavior.	70.0	60.0	33.3	55.0
Shows courtesy.	75.0	63.3	40.0	45.0
Adjusts to limitations.	70.0	46.7	26.7	35.0
Pays attention.	90.0	63.3	50.0	25.0
Gains satisfaction from work.	100.0	43.3	53.3	30.0
Participates enthusiastically.	90.0	76.7	53.3	40.0

Seventy per cent of the students demonstrated an improvement in attitudes toward self. However, the percentage of improvement for the individual items of the scale exceeded 75 per cent in all cases except Dress and appearance - 50 per cent; "Reacting well to frustration" - 45 per cent; and "Showing Leadership Qualities"- 35 per cent. Eighty per cent of the students demonstrated an improvement in attitudes towards school. This percentage of improvement exceeded the 75 per cent set as a quality indicator of effectiveness. The range of the per cents over the ten questions ranged from 50 per cent for improvement in "attending school regularly" to 100 per cent for both improvement in "accepting teacher assistance and criticisms" and "gaining satisfaction from work." The percentage of improvement was above the 75 per cent level in all cases except "adjusting to limitations" and "attending school regularly."

School B

Three paraprofessionals were assigned to School B. One paraprofessional assisted the Title I mathematics teacher three days a week. She worked with some forty students in groups of ten who came at four periods during the day. The two remaining days of the week, she worked with the Title I teacher of English as a Second Language. In both types of classes, she provided individualized help to students needing this situation.

The second paraprofessional worked four days a week with the Title I reading teacher and one day a week with the Title I speech teacher. In January, however, with the appointment of a Title I teacher of English as a Second Language, her program was changed to working two days a week with the reading teacher, two days a week with the ESL teacher, and one day a week with the speech teacher.

A family worker assigned to the school proved unsatisfactory and was removed upon request without replacement. Some of the reasons for the lack of success were indicated by the coordinator of the Title I program in the school. The school is approximately 73% Puerto-Rican, and the black paraprofessional who was assigned related not at all to this larger segment of the school population and was even minimally effective with the remaining small percentage of black students. In addition, the person assigned was professionally and academically inadequate. She also had an unusually high percentage of absenteeism. For these reasons her removal was requested in January, and due to the unfortunate experience in this first case, no replacement was requested.

Observation of the work of the two paraprofessionals in the classroom gave ample verification of the ratings of their effectiveness as judged by the Title I teachers with whom they worked. There was excellent collaboration between teachers and paraprofessionals, the latter worked well with pupils.

The excellent rapport between the Title I teachers and the paraprofessionals assigned under the Decentralized Program made for highly successful implementation of the program in this school. Moreover, the Title I coordinator has a good grasp of the objectives of the Title I program and its proper functioning in the non-public school. This led to a successful integration of and actual functioning of the program within the school as a whole. Adequate physical facilities, which were for the exclusive use of the Title I teachers and classes added a dimension, in that they were always available for these teachers and permitted effective displays of students' work and other visuals essential for the implementation of the program. In sum, the program in this school was very effective both in its functioning and its accurate implementation.

To what extent were program objectives realized? Unfortunately, it proved to be impossible to obtain data concerning pupil improvement in reading and mathematics in this school. The Title I teachers, working in a centralized program, had been instructed not to permit observers or release grades of their students. Authorization for the release of grades could not be obtained in time to be included in this report.

Changes in attitude, summarized in Tables 9 and 10, proved to be rather disappointing. Approximately 60 per cent of the students showed an improvement in attitudes towards self and school. The lowest percentage of improvement among the ten criteria for self- attitudes was in "getting along with classmates," where only 37.7 per cent were rated as improved. The greatest improvement in self-attitudes was in the proportion of students (93.3%) who demonstrated more positive attitudes in acting friendly and outgoing. In attitudes towards school, the lowest percentage was an indicated improvement for only 30 per cent of the students in "completing homework and classroom assignments." This may be due to the fact that little improvement was needed in this area. The proportions of students who showed improvement in "gaining satisfaction from work" (43.3%), and in "adjusting to their own limitations"(46.7%) were also low. As inso many instances where attitudinal changes were sought, the quality indicator of program effectiveness was not reached in School B.

School C. The Title I decentralized program assigned two paraprofessionals in school C, one in a library program and one as a family worker. The former worked from October 19th until June 20, on a five-day-a-week basis. She did not assist a Title I teacher, but conducted a supplementary library reading program which consisted essentially of readings in the classics, writing, and reading for reports and discussion purposes. The students involved were the better students of the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades who attended in separate periods each day. The program was conceived as an enrichment program in the language arts. The students read and discussed the classics, wrote poetry, published a small newspaper, learned library skills, and gave oral reports. The program was carried out in the library itself and is not interrupted by other students while the classes are in session. This arrangement made the books for the special reading program very accessible.

The family worker worked in this program from October 22 on a three day-a-week basis. Some of the aspects of the family worker position to which she has directed her attention are the following: discussions with the school administrator on children with physical handicaps, helping to set up health services, attending several PTA meetings as liaison worker, discussing career possibilities with parents and students, and chaperoning a group of approximately one hundred twenty parents and children to SOMPSEC (South Bronx Multi-Purpose Supplementary Educational Center) in P.S. 29. The basic thrust of this program is to improve the self-image of the black and Puerto Rican students.

Observation of the library program indicated that the paraprofessional, the mother of several children in the school had excellent rapport with the students in her groups. In several sessions attended by the evaluator, the students presented oral reports dealing with family origins. The discussion period that followed the presentation of the report, ably led by the paraprofessional, was judged to be a worthwhile approach to the development in pride in family origin and in the lands from which the families had come. Display of student work was also judged to be excellent.

The role of the family worker in the school is less well defined. Her duties are varied, and seem to be undertaken as a situation arises. There is evidently no program planned on a school wide basis. To some degree, this may reflect administrative attitudes; the school principal indicated, in an interview, that she would have preferred the assignment of a paraprofessional in some academic area.

One drawback of the program as it actually functioned in this school has been the occasional use of one or both of the paraprofessionals as substitute teachers in several emergency situations. This, of course, interfered with the proper functioning of their own programs.

How effective was the program in meeting its stated objectives? Since the academic aspect of this program was not remedial in character, there is no point in considering changes in reading scores over the period of the programs. The major focus of the library program was enrichment, and here the program was very effective, if one may use the pupils' published newspaper and poetry as criteria of effectiveness. The materials examined were judged as "good" or "very good" samples of work by children on the intermediate school level.

An unusual approach was utilized in estimating pupil change in attitudes to self and school in this instance, in that the ratings assigned were based on a joint appraisal by student and paraprofessional. Data were available for 15 students, and are reported in Tables 9 and 10.

Here, too, the results obtained fell much below the "75 per cent" improvement set as a quality indicator for program effectiveness. Approximately 50 per cent of the students were considered to have shown improvement in attitudes to self. Responses to individual items comprising the scale showed a very wide range, from 13.3 per cent who were judged to have improved in "confidence in abilities" to 93.0 per cent judged to have shown improvement in "getting along with classmates."

The proportion of students showing improvement in attitude to school was even lower; approximately one-third of the students were so judged. The range of those deemed to have shown improvement again showed a wide range when individual items of the scale were considered. Only 13.3 per cent were judged to have shown improvement in "completes work," while 53.3 per cent were considered as having shown improvement in "gains satisfaction from work" and "participates enthusiastically."

It should be noted, however, that many of the boys and girls included in this enrichment program were selected high achievers, and there may have been little room for improvement in attitude to self and school. Observation in the classrooms led the evaluator to feel that, as a group, the participants approached their work with confidence, and that their approach to school activities was highly positive.

School D. The paraprofessional assigned to School D spent five days a week in the school. She assisted the Title I Reading teacher with 30 students from the 4th, 5th, 6th grades for three days of the week and worked two days a week under the supervision of the Math teacher. In addition, she spent some part of one day each week working with either the Title I Speech teacher or the Title I ESL teacher on alternate weeks. Since she was a teacher herself in Cuba before coming to the United States, she functioned quite effectively in her role. She received the highest commendation from the Principal as well as the Title I teachers with whom she worked. Her Spanish background were of special help with students who had difficulties in the foreign language area.

Observation of the performance of the paraprofessional in the classroom reinforced the evaluation of her effectiveness obtained in interviews with the teachers and the school principal. She demonstrated a high level of capability in all of the areas to which she was assigned. Her rapport with students was excellent; planning for each child was good; collaboration between teachers and the paraprofessional was very good.

The one fault that one can find in this paraprofessional's services is that they were spread too thinly. In order to accomplish all that was needed, more paraprofessional help was required.

It proved to be impossible to obtain data concerning pupil performance in reading and mathematics. In this instance, again, Title I teachers refused to make this data available, on instructions from their supervisors. While permission was ultimatley obtained for release of these data, this permission was granted too late for inclusion of these data in this report.

The attitudinal scales were completed by the paraprofessional, working in consultation with the classroom teachers. Data are presented in Tables 9 and 10, for a random sample of 20 students.

Again, the obtained results demonstrated the difficulty of improving pupil attitudes in a short space of time. Here, approximately one-third of the pupils were judged to have shown improvement in attitude to self, and approximately 40 per cent were considered to have improved in attitude to school. Improvement by 75 per cent of the students, the standard used as the quality indicator of program effectiveness, was not reached on any of the items of the scales used to measure change in attitude.

School E. The paraprofessional assigned to School E was felt to be completely inadequate and her removal was requested by the school. Since no replacement was forthcoming, the school requested a plug-in for the use of the funds involved. In an interview with the principal, he seemed to prefer a continuation of this arrangement for the coming year.

4. Major Strengths and Weaknesses

In view of the great variation in these programs as they developed in the five schools, it is difficult to offer generalizations that are equally applicable in all situations. One observation, however, that can be made with high assurance is that a program is only as good as the quality of its personnel. Note that, in two of the situations in this district, the program was discontinued because the personnel assigned were unqualified. Evidently, the school administrator, once the program had been found wanting, refused to try again.

It would appear, too, that, unless the program that was offered was tied into the existing centralized Title I program, paraprofessionals assigned were afforded little guidance or supervision. It would seem that the school supervisor simply could not spare the time to provide the supervision needed.

The above are weaknesses; there were many strengths that served to counteract them. Perhaps the major asset that was noted was the excellant rapport between paraprofessionals and children. Even in those schools where change in pupil attitudes was not demonstrated by rating scale data, it was easy to observe the highly positive relationships that had developed, and the esteem with which the paraprofessional was held by the students.

5. Recommendations

In spite of its complete failure in one school, the decentralized program in District 6 has demonstrated its merit, and should be recycled. Some suggestions are offered for consideration by the District:

1. Provide a program of orientation and training, similar to that given to paraprofessionals working in centralized programs, to those

paraprofessionals who work in decentralized programs.

2. Provide for a greater degree of supervision to those paraprofessionals not working directly under the auspices of a Title I teacher.

3. Reevaluate the assignment of family workers to non-public schools. In the two instances in which such workers were assigned, the program did not prove to be successful.

4. Investigate the possibility of extending enrichment programs to other non-public schools, within the ESEA Title I guidelines.

E. DISTRICT 15 - SATURDAY AND HOLIDAY BUS TRIPS, NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Saturday and Holiday Bus Trip Program is a recycled program that was developed and agreed upon by the District 15 representatives, community action agency representatives, and representatives of the non-public schools. This is its third year of continuous operation. Two non-public schools participate in the program.

The program was established to meet the needs of the culturally deprived children of the district, whom, it wasagreed, were in need of an enrichment program that would help make them more aware of the places of cultural interest in the metropolitan area, including such places as Broadway and Off Broadway theatres, museums, historical sites, zoos and parks.

In each of the schools, a trip was scheduled once a month, from December through June, to a place of cultural interest in or around New York City. The trips included a bus for transportation, admission fees, and candy snacks for the children attending. The trips usually began at 9 A.M., when the bus departed from the school, and ended around 2 or 3 P.M., when the bus returned from the trip site to the school.

1. Program Objectives

The objectives of the program were stated as follows:

a. To increase the academic achievement of the pupils by providing experiences that will make the curriculum more meaningful.

b. To develop a large vocabulary and realistic concepts about places of interest and historical happenings so that the pupils may increase their reading levels.

2. Evaluation Procedures

The trip program evaluation was conducted during May and June of 1971. In accordance with this type of program, the evaluator chose to rely essentially upon the techniques of observation and interviewing to evaluate the program.

The observation consisted of attending one bus trip from each school and observing the childrens' interaction during the trip and at the trip site.

The interviews were informal and were conducted with a large number of the children on each trip and with all of the adults who were in charge.

Children were asked the following questions:

1. What do you like about the trip?
2. Would you like to go on more trips?
3. What did you learn today?

Adult supervisors were asked the following questions:

1. What do you like about the trips for the children?
2. What do you think the children learn from these trips?
3. Should the trips be continued?

3. Program Implementation

The program operated exactly as planned; from December through June, once a month, on either a Saturday or holiday, each of the non-public schools went on a trip - seven trips in all.

A bus was hired for the day and left from each school at 9 A.M. On arrival at the trip site, admissions were paid and the children were supervised as befitted the trip. On the trip home, the children were provided with two or three candy snacks and the bus returned to the neighborhood school before 3 P.M.

Each trip was supervised by a teacher licensed by the New York City Board of Education who was ably assisted by two nuns (the paraprofessionals or educational assistants listed in the proposal) who taught at the participating parochial school.

Children were chosen for the specific trip according to their age and developmental level; in an attempt to provide stimulating and enjoyable entertainment for each elementary age group.

The trip sites were chosen by the district coordinator of the program and the two school principals, who, in choosing, were careful to choose as varied and imaginative a program as they could. They were even careful enough and foresighted enough to plan a program that included indoor trips at theatres that offered live, professional entertainment during the winter months. These included trips to Manhattan to see puppet shows and musical presentations of Cinderella and Heidi. A summary of the trips taken by the two schools is presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Trips Taken by Participating Non-Public Schools

Month	Place	Participating Grades School A	Participating Grades School B	Participating Children School A	Participating Children School B
Dec.	Peggy Bridge Puppet Show	1&2	1	41	40
Jan.	Royal Theatre Hansel and Gretel	3&4	3	30	49
Feb.	Privincetown Playhouse Cinderella	5&6	4	42	36
Mar.	Flushing Meadow Hall of Science	7&8	6,7&8	35	42
April	Provincetown Playhouse Heidi	1&2	2	37	41
May	Turtle back Zoo New Jersey	3&4	2	38	40
June	Sagamore Hill Roosevelt's Home	7&8	3 to 8	40	38
				263	286

4. Program Effectiveness

The two objectives of the program, viz.,

a. To increase the academic achievement of the pupils by providing experiences that make the curriculum more meaningful, and

b. To develop a large vocabulary and realistic concepts about places of interest and historical happenings so that the pupils may increase their reading levels, were both thought to have been achieved, according to the school principals, just by taking the children on the trips. It was also felt by the sisters, who were the paraprofessionals on the bus trips, that by offering these underprivledged children experiences at theatres, museums, and zoos, a multiple effect was achieved. First, it offered these children an experience that they would probably not have the opportunity to see but for this program. Second, the idea of the trip provided the spark that encouraged animated discussion in the classroom and the home for weeks ahead of time. Third, it introduced new words and concepts into the childrens' lives; words and concepts that encouraged conversation and evoked questions from the expectant children.

During the trip, this evaluator observed children, who rarely ever travelled outside of their own neighborhood and almost certainly not to these trip sites, singing and joking in a spirited, youthful fashion that exhibited a camaraderie only a bus trip with friends could cultivate. These are things that children easily remember, and recall with happiness for a long time.

At the Turtleback Zoo in New Jersey and Roosevelt's home in Sagamore Hill, Long Island, the evaluator saw the children eagerly questioning the people in charge; asking every imaginable question. And they talked among themselves in the fresh spring air, learning in so many immeasurable ways.

Their every sense was appealed to. The numerous blooming trees and greening lawns engaged their eyes and their hands; and the animals at the zoo and the spacious house and grounds at Sagamore Hill filled their noses with scents and sights they usually see only in books or on television. And the ineffable taste of these new delights was everywhere.

The trips, without a doubt, made the curriculum more meaningful, and contributed to the development of "realistic concepts about places of interest and historical happenings." But did "90 per cent of the students show satisfactory achievement as judged by the teachers," the criterion set as a quality indicator for program effectiveness? The teachers were impressed with the values of the program, but no attempt was made to determine pupil learnings. Certainly, the children, in immediate interviews with the evaluator, gave many indications of academic learnings they had gathered on the more "academic" trips; and there were different types of learnings on the other trips that children carried away with them. Class activities after the trips were given over to reinforcement of pupil learnings and teachers reported that children were eager to talk about their experiences. To the teachers, it was clear that the program had broadened the children's range of experiences and introduced them to activities which would not have been a normal part of their lives. No more formal attempt as measuring pupil learnings was made; indeed, the teachers would have resisted any attempt to do so.

5. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

The strengths of the program included the following:

a. Excited, enthusiastic children, sharing and learning together.

b. A capable and concerned teacher in charge, and two nuns, as educational assistants, preparing the children for the trip.

c. A well directed program with the program director, school principals, and others interacting to help choose meaningful trips for the children.

d. The opportunity for underprivledged children to leave their neighborhood and visit places of cultural interest in their own city; places which they might otherwise not get to experience.

The weakness, if any, is that the non-public schools in no way measure the effectiveness of this trip program. It might also be considered a weakness of the program that so few children get to go on one trip a year.

6. Recommendations

This program in District 15 has amply demonstrated its effectiveness, and well merits recycling. The following suggestions are offered for consideration by the District:

a. The program should be expanded to include more children and more trips.

b. Parents should be included in the trip program.

c. More educational trips and longer trips should be allowed and encouraged.

d. A greater variety of programs should be encouraged in the future, e.g., opera, ballet, modern dance, and symphony orchestra.

e. The non-public schools should set up a formal evaluation procedure to measure the effectiveness of the entire program in meeting its objectives.

F. DISTRICT 17 - PROGRAM FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

The original component "Program for Non-Public Schools" dated October 5, 1970, provided for pupils of the three eligible Jewish day schools in the district. On November 13, a modification of the component added services for pupils of the one Lutheran and the three Catholic schools in the district.

The Lutheran school selected a "plug-in" to the centralized program of the Non-Public School Division of the Board of Education and is therefore outside the bounds of this evaluation, which is concerned solely with district decentralized programs for Non-Public schools.

A Homework Helper program was planned for the Jewish schools at their request. The program was to serve approximately 45 children from the three eligible Jewish elementary schools in the district. Homework Helper programs were to be conducted in two Centers, each supervised by a licensed teacher, with two educational assistants and 10 student aides. The program also provided for text books, library books, periodicals, programmed work books and classroom supplies. Pupils were to be selected for the program on the basis of academic need and Title I eligibility. The goal of the program was to bring the pupils to grade level in basic skills in reading, mathematics, and other school subjects. There were to be two hour sessions, two or three times a week, for a total of 80 sessions. The program was to function from October 26 to May 31.

The "Remedial Reading Program for Catholic Schools" provided for participation by the three eligible Catholic Schools in District 17. The program planned remediation services for approximately 142 disadvantaged pupils in grades 1-8. The goals of the program were to raise the educational aspirations and the achievement levels of selected pupils who showed a need for remediation services. Each school was to have the services of a Corrective Reading Teacher and an Educational Assistant, to work five days a week, during regular school hours. The services were to be supplemented by educational materials such as phonographs, tape recorders, filmstrip projectors, library books, and programmed learning books. The program was to function from January 4 to June 4.

1. Evaluation Procedures

In the absence of pre- and post-program objective tests the evaluation of the Jewish day schools was based on visits, observation of the tutoring sessions, and interviews with program teachers, educational assistants, student aides, pupils, and classroom teachers who referred the pupils for tutoring.

The program in the Catholic schools was evaluated by visits to the three schools, observations of library sessions, and interviews of principals, corrective reading teachers, educational assistants, pupils, and classroom teachers. No objective test results were available.

2. Program Implementation and Effectiveness

The two program teachersin the Jewish day schools were mature adults, experienced in teaching elementary school pupils in both public and nonpublic schools. They were thoroughly aware of the cultural backgrounds of the pupils and the aides. The atmosphere in both centers was orderly, friendly, and relaxed. Good planning and organization were evident. The educational assistants were college majors in education; they seem well prepared, were informal and had good rapport with the aides and the pupils. There was an atmosphere of learning evident. The pupils got started as soon as they came in; the aides were ready too. The aides were aware of the goals of the program and the means to attain them. The pupils seemed to enjoy the sessions with their adolescent tutors. They expressed a delight in being tutored by the secondary school tutors and without exception expressed optimism about their progress. The attendance records were witness to the fact that the pupils liked their homework helper session.

The classroom teachers reported that the Homework Helper sessions were unusually successful. When asked to comment specifically on the performance in class of a random sample of 18 students (12½% of the participants), only 2 were judged to have shown no effects of the tutoring program; in both cases academic retardation was complicated by emotional problems. The teachers reported that the large majority of the referred pupils displayed improved attention in class, a desire to recite and a reduction of fear of criticism by classmates.

The principals of the three schools emphatically favored recycling of the program. Their recommendations were for an increased number of sessions (four times a week) and for earlier and fuller delivery of educational materials.

The program in each of the three Catholic schools was well organized. Space was available for library sessions and storage of equipment and materials. The three teachers were well qualified by training and experience. The teachers and educational assistants were selected and supervised by the principals of the schools. They were in daily communication and their relationship seemed to be an informal, professional one. The educational assistants were residents of the school neighborhood, whose children had attended or were attending the school; the atmosphere in each of the schools was relaxed. Small groups of children reported to the library, found materials ready for them and proceeded to read the story for the day. The discussion of the story was informal and there was interchange between pupils as well as with the teacher. The children were encouraged to borrow books for home reading and were helped to do so by the educational assistant. Filmstrip sessions were conducted in the same informal, competent manner.

The classroom teachers reported that the pupils displayed greater interest in English classes and frequently referred to the library books which they had read or were reading.

The principals of all three schools gave high praise to the program, as did the classroom teachers. They felt that the program filled a special need of the non-public schools, which do not have adequate library services. They recommended that the program should be recycled and should be started in September rather than January.

3. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

The major strengths of the program, as it operated in both Jewish and Catholic non-public schools included the following:

a. Capable and concerned administrators and teachers, all concerned with developing as effective a program as possible.

b. A highly effective staff of paraprofessionals and student aides who were markedly successful in building rapport with students, and who were able not only to improve their skills, but to enhance their personal self-image.

c. Enthusiastic children, carrying over learnings from the special situation to the classroom.

The two weaknesses that might be cited are:

a. Failure to include enough children in the program, and

b. Failure to enlist parental involvement in the program.

4. Recommendations

This program undoubtedly merits recycling. It is recommended that the program be extended to include larger numbers of pupils in each school.

G. DISTRICT 19 - PARAPROFESSIONAL SUPPORTIVE SERVICES IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In the Amended Proposal for Evaluation dated March 31, 1971, this program was described as follows:

"This program will involve the services of paraprofessionals working under the supervision of centrally assigned guidance counselors and social workers in the four eligible non-public schools in the district. The program will be initiated on February 1, 1971."

Paraprofessionals were to be assigned to the program for a total of 468 days in the four schools.

1. Program Objectives

The sole objective of the program was specified as: "To improve the attitudes toward self and school of participating pupils."

2. Evaluation Procedures

The objective of this evaluation was to determine the extent to which attitudes toward self and school of participating pupils had improved during the course of the project. To accomplish this, teacher ratings were obtained of a sampling of students from the four schools involved, using the Scale for Rating Change in Pupil Attitudes Toward Self and School.

However, as attitudinal changes are difficult to assess directly and especially over a short span of time, it was deemed appropriate to include interviews with all personnel involved in any way in the program. Therefore, guidance counselors, principals, paraprofessionals and in one case, where the paraprofessional worked with them, the social worker and school psychologist were interviewed. Although all interviews were open-ended, attempts were made to ascertain the respondents' perceptions of how the program was functioning in their respective schools. Attempts were made to bring out any conflicts that may have existed or any malfunctioning of the program, as well as its positive aspects and suggestions for improvement.

In addition, observations of paraprofessional activities were also made to help to determine effectiveness of the program.

3. Program Implementation

Four non-public schools participated in the program. Three of the schools have over 600 elementary students, while the fourth has over 300. In all four schools the students are overwhelmingly black and Puerto Rican.

Six paraprofessionals worked in the four schools a total of 25 days a week. They were assigned to a total of eight guidance counselors who serviced the four schools for a total of nineteen days a week. Three social workers were assigned to the four schools for a total of seven days, and one school psychologist serviced two of the schools. In two of the schools, the paraprofessionals were assigned to work with the social workers and the school psychologist.

The implementation of the program was to take place on February 1; five of the six paraprofessionals were in the schools within the first two weeks after that date, the sixth began services at the beginning of March.

Selection of the paraprofessionals was accomplished cooperatively by the non-public schools and the Board of Education's Office of State and Federally-Assisted Program's E.S.E.A. Title I - Non-Public Schools Clinical and Guidance Service. The schools involved recruited interested and capable individuals, who were then interviewed by the Coordinator of the program. During this interview, the paraprofessionals were made aware of the Suggested Guidelines for the Use of Family Assistants Assigned to Guidance Counselors in the Non-Public Schools, which had been used in previous programs in other districts. Although in previous programs, orientation workshops had been conducted, no further orientation or training, other than the initial interview, was given to this group prior to their entrance into the schools.

In order to ensure confidentiality, which is an important aspect of guidance work, no paraprofessional was assigned to the parochial school to which she would normally send her children. In this way, the counselors could make greater use of paraprofessionals in sharing records or other confidential information, with more freedom.

The assignment of personnel among the four schools is as follows:

a. School A, which has 620 students of whom 43 per cent were black, 45 per cent Puerto Rican, and the rest other, had the services of one psychologist one day per week, two social workers each two days a week, three guidance counselors (two of whom served each three days a week and the third, one day a week), and two paraprofessionals, each serving five days a week. Therefore, total services consisted of six professionals for twelve days a week and two paraprofessionals for ten days a week.

b. School B, which has 650 children of whom 60 per cent were black and 30 per cent Puerto Rican had the services of one psychologist for one day a week, one social worker for one day a week, two guidance counselors, one for three days and one for two days a week, and one paraprofessional for five days a week. There was a total of four professionals for a total of seven days a week and one paraprofessional for five days a week.

c. School C, which had over 600 children, of whom 55 per cent were below the poverty level had the services of one social worker one day a week, two guidance counselors each two days a week, and two paraprofessionals, one five days a week and the other two days a week. Total services were three professionals for five days a week, and two paraprofessionals for seven days a week.

d. School D, with 340 students of whom 30 per cent were black, 68 per cent were Puerto Rican and 2 per cent were white, was serviced by one social worker one day a week, two guidance counselors, one for two days a week and the other for one day a week, and one paraprofessional for three days a week. Total services rendered included three professionals for four days a week and one paraprofessional for three days a week.

Included in the activities carried on by the paraprofessionals, the following were enumerated by one or more schools:

a. Make appointments with clinics, hospitals and doctors.

b. Take children and parents for appointments.

c. Care for younger siblings while accompanying parent for appointments.

d. Take children for medical, dental, optemetric and psychiatric appointments directly from the school (with parental approval).

e. Take children home following these, if they end after school time.

f. Care for younger children either at home or at school to enable parent to come for interviews with school personnel.

g. Accompany counselor on home visits.

h. Escort clients to and from guidance office where necessary.

i. Perceptual testing of children (one school).

j. Observe group guidance sessions.

k. Tutor children not receiving remedial help - spelling, reading, arithmetic.

l. Read to groups of children.

m. Testing of children.

n. Give supportive counseling to children needing extra attention, under counselor's supervision and generally following a brief interview of the client by the counselor each session.

o. Observation of a child during group or other activities as a follow-up to help counselor to a better understanding of a case with whom she has limited contact due to her once-a-week school contact.

p. Help the counselor in group guidance with an entire class.

q. Help children with homework where no parent help available.

r. Conduct crochet and sewing classes to further motor control.

s. Take one or more children who are a disturbance in the classroom for periods of play, sewing, etc. to relieve tension, relax, etc.

t. Take a few individual children on a regular basis for a sort of counseling interview.

u. Clerical duties, such as typing of test results, preparing of student records for counselor from school records, sending away for guidance materials, recording and filing materials, contacting high schools for eighth grade students, researching community resources (after-school centers), contacting these, some supply purchasing.

v. Make trips to District Office for payroll.

The work of the paraprofessional was so structured that ordinarily she was able to carry on should the counselor be absent.

No facilities, strictly speaking, were provided for the paraprofessionals working in these schools. They made use of whatever was available to the professional with whom they worked. In one school, because use is made of the adjoining Sisters' Residence, space was reasonably adequate. In the other three, however, meagre space existed even for the professionals who had small rooms with few facilities. When more than one guidance worker, professional or paraprofessional was present on a given day, use was made of whatever other room was available, such as a faculty room, library, hallway, etc. No fault can be attached, however, to the schools which were completely cooperative in providing whatever they could.

The guidance counselors, and therefore, the paraprofessionals, had no phone or typewriter, and relied on those used by the school. The use of the one phone in the school office was an inconvenience and a waste of time for guidance workers and school staff, who were forced to wait on each other. Besides, guidance workers sometimes returned several times to the phone to make their calls, which meant several flights of stairs each time. One paraprofessional solved the problem by making phone calls from her home and taking typing to do at home also, although she was not reimbursed for either of these.

Records of students, which were in the guidance office, were generally available to the paraprofessionals depending on the needs.

Other materials, such as play materials, used by paraprofessionals were those made available to the guidance department.

Problems involved in program implementation were twofold. Lack of space and facilities, as mentioned above, although they did not prevent the program from operating, did add to inconvenience, confusion and a loss of precious time. All personnel in the three schools mentioned this lack of space as a serious problem.

A second problem mentioned by at least half of the principals and the professionals involved was a lack of orientation for both the paraprofessional and the counselor as to their respective roles in the use of the paraprofessionals in guidance. A lack of specific training for the paraprofessional was also considered a part of this problem.

4. Program Effectiveness

Attempts were made to obtain teacher ratings on as many students as possible with whom paraprofessionals had worked directly by using the Scale for Rating Change in Pupil Attitudes to Self and School, since improvement of attitudes was the sole objective listed for the program. However, as the amount of time which the paraprofessionals spent working directly with specific children varied in the different schools, the sampling obtained is not distributed evenly among the schools. Therefore, it may not be truly representative of the schools, inasmuch as over half of the sample obtained was from one school where one paraprofessional was involved. In the other schools, either the paraprofessionals were less involved directly or were involved with few pupils, or the teachers declined to complete all or part of the questionnaire because the time span in which the paraprofessional had been working with the student was too brief to be able to measure change.

However, a total of 36 children were rated by about 15 teachers. One student was from first grade, 11 from third grade, seven from fourth grade, five from fifth grade, nine from sixth grade, two from seventh and one from eighth grade, thus giving a range of grade levels.

A summary of these ratings is presented in Tables 13 and 14. Data were available for 35 children on the scale measuring changes in attitudes to self; for 31 children on the scale measuring attitude to school.

Table 13

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING IMPROVEMENT IN ATTITUDE TO SELF

Item	Per Cent
Happy and relaxed	68.6
Tries new things	54.3
Works independently	37.1
Gets along with classmates	71.4
Confident in abilities	40.0
Dress and appearance	51.4
Takes pride in work	45.7
Friendly and outgoing	68.6
Reacts well to frustration	20.0
Shows leadership qualities	20.0

Table 14

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING IMPROVEMENT IN ATTITUDE TO SCHOOL

Item	Per Cent
Cooperates with teachers and pupils	48.4
Accepts teacher assistance, criticism	51.6
Completes work	41.9
Attends school regularly	64.5
Controls inappropriate behavior	45.1
Shows courtesy	51.6
Adjusts to limitations	38.7
Pays attention	36.1
Gains satisfaction from work	48.4
Participates enthusiastically	41.9

It is evident that the program was not too successful in changing pupil attitudes in a positive direction. Approximately 40 per cent of the pupils were judged to have shown a positive change in attitudes to self; approximately 45 per cent were judged to have shown a positive change in attitudes to school. On the other hand, approximately one-fifth of the students were considered to have shown less favorable attitudes toward self and school at the conclusion of the program than at the entrance into the program.

Interviews with the four principals of the schools revealed satisfaction with what the program was accomplishing in student help. All were happy with the individuals chosen for the paraprofessional program, and felt that they had good rapport with the children. Two expressed the desire to have other paraprofessionals working in the school. Two principals mentioned the lack of sufficient orientation for both professionals and paraprofessionals and the lack of specific training for paraprofessionals as a detriment to the effectiveness of the program. Two considered the frequent change of professionals in the school as well as so many counselors with each having but a day or two or three in the school detrimental to the effectiveness of the whole guidance program and causing confusion to children and school.

Interviews with the eight counselors to whom the paraprofessionals were assigned revealed a favorable attitude on the part of all to having paraprofessionals working with them. All felt that the paraprofessionals were helping students improve their attitudes toward self and school, either directly by their work with them, or by freeing the counselor so more time could be spent with students needing professional help. They were quick to give specific examples of work accomplished by the paraprofessionals in working with the children, and were grateful for the many little "chores" the paraprofessionals accomplished daily for them. One counselor, however, had serious reservations regarding the attitudes and personal qualifications of one paraprofessional. All other counselors expressed a great deal of confidence in the other paraprofessionals who worked with them. Two of the counselors questioned the wisdom of the choice of simply "other middle class whites" to work with black and Puerto Rican children who would be better understood and helped to better attitudes toward self and school by those of their own race and speaking their language.

The paraprofessionals interviewed expressed pleasure at the work they were doing to help the children. They felt they could see change in the children they worked with, even though sometimes the teachers could not in the regular classrooms. They all appeared to feel confident in their ability to handle the situation, and expressed no feeling of need for further training, even when asked. One did, however, express interest in furthering her own education in this field apart from the program, because she enjoyed helping these children. They all spoke of their willingness to work with and help the counselors in whatever help was needed.

Observations of the paraprofessionals working with either a small group or individual children confirmed the opinions given by the principals and the counselors regarding the ability of the paraprofessionals to relate to the children and gain their confidence. Although the number of observations were limited, paraprofessionals were observed working with children on a one-to-one basis, in small groups, and in a large classroom group. In all cases, the paraprofessionals were liked by the children and seemed to have established a very good relationship with them.

5. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

In general, it appears that this program is on the way to achieving its objectives although the change in attitudes may not always be immediately observable. Its major strengths were in the personal qualifications of the paraprofessionals who were chosen for the program, and the cooperation within the schools, particularly between the professionals and the paraprofessionals in the guidance program. The major weakness appeared to be a lack of adequate space and equipment, as well as a lack of adequate orientation and training prior to the beginning of the program. The disadvantage of numerous professionals assigned for a few days each was offset by the comparatively longer assignment of the paraprofessionals.

6. Recommendations

In spite of the fact that teacher ratings of pupil improvement did not reach the level set as indicative of program effectiveness, it is felt that the program, as it developed, had made great strides in meeting its objectives, and recycling is recommended. Some suggestions are offered for consideration by the District:

a. Provide better orientation and training for the entire paraprofessional program. Counselors at times did not know that a paraprofessional was being assigned to them, and did not quite know what they were to do with her when she arrived. Paraprofessionals did not know what they were supposed to do, and even seemed unaware of the guidelines issued by the coordinator. A brief workshop or training period should be held before the beginning of the program for the paraprofessionals. The professionals should also be informed more clearly what their role is in the program.

b. Better space and facilities are needed for the program. A phone and a typewriter are necessary for use by paraprofessionals and professionals in the guidance program.

c. More careful screening of workers is necessary, especially in view of the minimal training that can be given in the program. One must not overlook the possibility that a paraprofessional must function without a professional present should the counselor be absent for any reason.

d. Examine the organization of the entire helping services. Fewer people with a greater number of days in a school would enhance the services of the professionals and would have an effect on that of the paraprofessionals in this program.

H. DISTRICT 21 - SERVICES FOR ELIGIBLE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This program was to provide for the assignment of paraprofessionals to assist Title I teachers in two non-public schools, in various Central Programs. The programs in both schools were to run from November 1970 until the end of June 1971.

1. Program Objectives

The objectives of the program as stated were as follows:

a. To improve the achievement of participating pupils in reading and math.

b. To improve the attitudes toward self and school of the participating pupils.

c. To develop proficiency in English among non-English speaking pupils.

2. Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation of this project was carried out through interviews with the school principals, observation of the remedial classes established. analysis of pre- and post- ratings of students by the paraprofessionals who worked with them in the areas of improvement of attitudes toward self and school and development of the proficiency to use English as a second language. It had been planned to analyze pre- and post-test results in reading and mathematics, but this evaluator was refused access to these data.

3. Program Implementation

This program provided for remedial and developmental services on a three day a week basis in the areas of reading, mathematics, and language (including speech improvement). The teachers for the Program were assigned as part of a Central Board Title I Program and spent one day in each school per week instructing small groups of children in their specific specialty area. Paraprofessionals were assigned to work with these teachers under a decentralized program funding arrangement. The Title I teachers in the program refused to communicate with the evaluator relative to their work since they were being evaluated through a different source, and refused to make available any quantitative data relative to student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. In doing so, they acted on direction from their Central Board supervisors. The guidance counselor assigned to the Program was also hesitant to discuss her activities and sought clearance from the District Office to determine whether she had to answer any questions about her work with students and any progress that had been made. This uncooperative stand on the part of the professional personnel interfered markedly with the conduct of the evaluation; they were extremely defensive when observations were made of the program. The quantitative data obtained (noted later in this report) was provided by one of the paraprofessionals with eight students who had been assigned to her for individualized instruction in language. The other paraprofessional felt that she could not rate any of the children; she was apparently apprehensive about her own security in the situation. Although there were attempts to press this matter further, the decision by the District Office regarding the separation of the Centralized and Decentralized Programs made it virtually impossible to obtain any data that might be construed as representing an evaluation of the Centralized Program.

The atmosphere in both schools was considered to be less than adequate for the instruction of children. In both schools, sanitary conditions (illumination, ventilation) and lunch facilities were poor. At the time of this report, plans were being discussed to merge the two schools due to overcrowding in one of them; however, much would have to be done with the less crowded facility to make it more habitable for the students who attend.

The duties performed by the paraprofessionals in both schools was observed to be similar (the same Title I teachers were assigned to both schools and had established the same programs in both schools). Thus, in all areas, the paraprofessionals corrected papers, rexographed material, and worked with individual children assigned to them. In the words of one paraprofessional, "the teachers work with groups and I work with individuals." In one lesson observed, the paraprofessional worked with a non-English speaking child on comprehension of a pre-primer paragraph. The child was challenged by the questions asked, seemed to enjoy looking for picture clues to answer the questions and related well to the adult. Another lesson, in mathematics, found the child working on addition examples while the paraprofessional sat with him and encouraged him in his work. When an error was made, the student was helped to see where he had erred, and he corrected his response. The major difficulty observed in these individual tutorial sessions was that of cramped space. While the teacher worked with a group of 5, the paraprofessional, in the same room, worked with a single child. However, the voices of teacher and children were very distracting to the child being worked with alone and his attention to what he was doing often wandered. According to the paraprofessionals, on the days that the teachers were not present, conditions for individual instruction were better.

Materials used in the Program were considered to be sparse but functional for the participating students. In the areas of reading and mathematics, materials such as SRA laboratories, phonetic workbooks, basal readers, word games, mathematics workbooks and puzzles were used by teacher and paraprofessional to attain instructional goals, but there were not enough materials available for all of the children to use. Rexographed materials were resorted to in many cases; these were prepared by teachers and run off by the paraprofessionals.

Storage facilities were very poor in one of the schools, where all the teachers had to share a single closet for their equipment. When the teachers were not there, the closet could not be opened, since the teachers retained possession of the key. In the other school, a room was set aside for the use of the Program with adequate storage space; the paraprofessional in this school had free reign in the use of the materials.

It is pertinent to note that the difference in training of the paraprofessionals might have played a part in their relative responsibilities. One, a college graduate, seemed to be more laden with instructional responsibility than the other, a high school graduate with minimal instructional skills. Also pertinent to note is the administrative involvement in the two schools that might have affected program effectiveness. In one school, the principal was very involved with the teachers and paraprofessionals, observed lessons and took an active role in communicating with District personnel. In the other school, the principal rarely observed, and seemed to be more involved with the administrative aspects of the school rather than with supervision of instruction. In both schools, discipline of students was a problem.

4. Program Effectiveness

This program was considered to be of minimal value for the participating students. Mitigating problems of limited space, sparseness of materials, facilities inconducive for the instruction of children, limited administrative involvement in one of the schools, and the inadequate amount of instructional time (one day a week in each school per specialty area), raises many questions concerning the impact that could be made over a seven month period with these children who appear to need so much more.

In one area, however, the program evidently achieved its objectives. The non-English speaking children in the two schools apparently benefited markedly from instruction in English. The progress shown by the six pupils, who comprised the total non-English speaking population in both schools, is summarized in Table 15.

Table 15

STUDENTS SHOWING IMPROVEMENT IN ABILITY TO PARTICIPATE IN CLASS ACTIVITIES USING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

	Number Improving Indicated Scale Units			Proportion Improving
Area	One	Two	Three	Two or More Units
Understands, follows directions		1	4	83.3
Converses with classmates		2	3	83.3
Follows lessons taught		2	3	83.3
Carries through assignments			5	83.3
Imitates conversations with teachers and adults	1	2	2	66.7
Asks questions of teachers and adults	1	3	1	66.7
Volunteers information		1	5	100.0
Volunteers opinions	1	1	4	83.3
Completes homework	1	2	3	83.3
Works up to capacity		1	4	83.3

The program appears to have been less effective, however, in improving attitudes to self and school. Here, it proved to be possible to obtain ratings for only 8 pupils. Only one paraprofessional consented to provide data in these areas. This sample, of course, is much too small to permit generalizations; the data are reported in Tables 16 and 17 for the record.

Table 16

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING IMPROVEMENT IN ATTITUDE TOWARD SELF

Item	Per Cent
Happy and Relaxed	75.0
Tries new things	87.5
Works independently	37.5
Gets along with classmates	50.0
Confident in his abilities	62.5
Dress and appearance	62.5
Takes pride in work	87.5
Friendly and outgoing	87.5
Reacts well to frustration	37.5
Shows leadership qualities	50.0

Table 17

PER CENT OF PUPILS SHOWING IMPROVEMENT IN ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

Item	Per Cent
Cooperates with teachers and pupils	75.0
Accepts teacher criticism, assistance	62.5
Completes work	50.0
Attends school regularly	87.5
Controls inappropriate behavior	50.0
Shows courtesy	62.5
Adjusts to limitations	50.0
Pays attention	62.5
Gains satisfaction from work	75.0
Participates enthusiastically	50.0

5. Major Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

The major strengths of the program may be identified as follows:

a. Interested and concerned paraprofessionals who followed teacher prescriptions for their students very carefully.

b. An ability on the part of the paraprofessionals to show warmth and encouragement.

The major weaknesses noted included:

a. Insufficient materials for pupils in the three areas of reading, mathematics and language.

b. Insufficient administrative involvement in one of the schools.

c. Poor physical facilities which were inconducive to the instruction of children.

d. Inadequate teacher time in the three areas to be emphasized.

6. Summary and Recommendations

This program, which was conducted in two non-public schools within District 21 K, was established to improve pupil attitudes toward self and school, increase ability to use English as a second language and to improve skills in reading and mathematics. Many mitigating circumstances interfered with the conduct of this program, not the least of which was the insufficient amount of teacher time allotted to the program. The paraprofessionals worked very well with the individual students assigned to them, some improvement being shown in attitude, and marked improvement in ability to use English functionally. However, the overall effects of the program over a seven month period were felt to be minimal. Recommendations for improvement of the program are noted below:

a. Increase of instructional time so that students can be serviced on a continuous basis; one day a week of special instruction in each area does not appear to be enough for these children.

b. Implementation of a group guidance program so that attitudes can be explored and changed.

c. Continuation of paraprofessional services and, if at all possible, increase in time allotted for this service.

d. More materials of a varied nature should be made available for pupil use to heighten skill acquisition and to enhance pupil motivation to learn.

I. DISTRICT 29 - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

This program was established in the one eligible non-public school in the district to provide a program of diagnosis and remediation in reading. A corrective reading teacher and a school aide were to be assigned to this school to improve reading achievement among the participating pupils.

1. Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation of this project was carried out through interviews with the school principal, observation of the remedial classes established, analysis of pre- and post-test results of the pupils who participated, and interviews with other staff members regarding the improvement of their pupils in the classroom.

2. Program Implementation

This program, implemented in November 1970, placed primary emphasis on corrective reading help for 117 4th, 5th and 6th grade youngsters who were experiencing considerable academic difficulty in the classroom as a result of poor reading skills. The pupils were worked with in small groups each day for forty minute periods, and some were seen for individual attention before the start of the regular school day.

Small group sessions involved work in phonetic grounding, word analysis, comprehension exercises (oral and silent), and some spelling. Pupils wrote their own creative stories and poems and were presented with books on their level for outside reading. Each pupil subscribed to "My Weekly Reader," which was used in some sessions for oral and silent reading and comprehension exercises. A typical lesson observed dealt with the area of phonics; the teacher worked with the students on the short vowel sounds using word families, and noting the change in the vowel sound when the final "e" was added. The culminating activity for this lesson on phonics was a hidden word game devised for reinforcement of the phonetic short vowel sounds prepared by the teacher on rexographed sheets. The pupils enjoyed this activity where success depended upon their skill in finding as many hidden words as possible.

Other lessons observed were of a similar high caliber. It was felt that the warmth shown by the teacher in her relationships with the children heightened their motivation to succeed. Evident pleasure was noted on the faces of some of the pupils when they were able to solve a particularly difficult problem, which was reinforced by the compliments given to them by their teacher.

Materials used in the program were felt to be useful for the pupils, but quantity and variety of materials was limited. Some of the materials that were considered to be excellent for the pupils were the SRA Reading Labs, Phonics We Use workbooks, Reader's Digest Skill Series and accompanying work books, Reading Success Series, and assorted library books on different reading levels for pleasure reading. Budgetary allotment for the program was not sufficient for the purchase of more materials and a good deal of teacher prepared rexographed material was in use in the sessions.

The paraprofessional aide was not present during this observation period due to an automobile accident that incapacitated her. She was not expected to return for the balance of the school year and no attempt had been made to replace her. The services of the aide, who worked from the beginning of the program until her accident in March were employed mainly in the clerical and monitorial area. She assisted the teacher in handling of records, worked in the principal's office as a part time assistant clerk, and was responsible for bringing the children to the sessions from their classes. She was not involved in the instructional part of the program. Without the services of the aide, the teacher's responsibilities were heightened and detracted somewhat from the instructional time offered to students. According to the principal, psychological services were also to be provided for the program, but a licensed psychologist had not been assigned as late as May of the school year. This was unfortunate since some of the children were in need of evaluation that could have pointed up more clearly their needs in the educational and emotional areas.

3. Program Effectiveness

This program was successful in meeting its objective of improving reading achievement among participating pupils. According to teachers of these pupils, they had seen an increase in attention span, a stronger motivation to read, and a greater willingness to use reading as a means of acquiring further subject matter knowledge. Some narrative comments obtained from teachers were: "He's much happier now that he can read a little better; he seems to try more." "I've had little or no trouble with .... since he has been in the reading program; at the beginning of September, I thought it would be all over for the both of us." "The reading teacher is great! She has helped three of my children to the point that they are now doing independent stories expressing their ideas." "I wish she were in the classroom with me; whatever she's doing, it seems to be working." These and other comments attested to the general change in attitude toward learning displayed by children who were program participants.

Considerable growth in reading on all three grade levels was noted over the seven month instructional period. The relevant data are summarized in Table 18, which presents mean growth scores of the three grade groups on the Gates - McGinnitie Reading Test.

Table 18

MEAN GROWTH IN READING OF PARTICIPATING PUPILS

Grade	N	Growth in Months Comprehension	Vocabulary
4	37	10.0	12.6
5	42	8.8	11.7
6	38	9.6	15.1
Total	117	9.5	13.2

The pupils showed 9.5 months growth in comprehension, and slightly more than 13 months growth in vocabulary in the seven month period. Progress of the top 75 per cent of the group was even greater. Here, the quality indicator of program effectiveness called for 10 months gain in reading achievement over a 10 month period of instruction. Actually, instruction covered only seven months, and the gains noted far exceeded the 10 month requirement (Table 19).

Table 19

MEAN GROWTH IN READING OF TOP 75 PER CENT OF PARTICIPATING PUPILS

Grade	N	Growth in Months Comprehension	Vocabulary
4	28	12.7	16.6
5	32	11.9	14.8
6	29	13.9	19.9
Total	89	12.8	17.2

4. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

The major strengths of the program may be summarized as follows:

a. High teacher and student motivation.

b. Excellent teaching techniques that stimulated and challenged the learner.

c. Superior teacher-prepared materials that were directed to basic individual needs of students.

d. Consistent periods of instruction on a daily basis.

The major weaknesses of the program, as it developed, were:

a. Unavailability of paraprofessional assistance throughout the latter half of the program.

b. Insufficient quantities of purchased materials for pupil use.

c. Lack of psychological services that would have been of value in formulation of individualized programs and in referral of some pupils for mental health services.

5. Summary and Recommendations

This program, which had as its major objective, the improvement of reading achievement among participating pupils, was highly successful. The corrective reading teacher used very fine instructional techniques in her work with the 117 4th, 5th and 6th graders who were enrolled, and while purchased materials were not sufficient in quantity, she created her own to supplement existing supplies. Teachers of pupils enrolled in the program were very positive in their reactions to their students' accomplishments and felt that the children had grown in other areas as well as in reading. Recommendations for further enhancement of this program are noted below:

a. The program should be instituted in the beginning of the school year for maximum pupil benefit.

b. A sufficient quantity of supplies should be made available for pupil use to insure for every student the necessary tools with which to work.

c. All paraprofessional and psychological services intended for the program should be obtained as soon as possible and maintained throughout the course of the program.

J. DISTRICT 30 - REMEDIAL PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This program is a recycling of a similar project operated during 1969-1970. It is a remedial program that supplies different services to each of the two school involved. At School A, there is a remedial reading program with one reading teacher and one educational assistant, each working three days a week for thirty weeks. Also included for this school is a trip program, designed to aid in reading improvement.

At the other school in the program, School B, there is a remedial reading program with one reading specialist working one day a week for thirty weeks. In addition, a speech therapist and a mathematics teacher were assigned, working the same schedule. Along with these specialists there were to be two educational assistants each working a five day week, six hours daily, for one hundred and fifty days. One family assistant was also to be provided two days a week for sixty days to work with the guidance counselor who is provided from the Central Board of Education.

Each school is provided with text books, library books, classroom and office supplies, and busing where needed.

1. Program Objectives

The objectives of the program were stated as follows:

a. To improve the mathematics achievement of the participating pupils.

b. To improve the reading achievement of the participating pupils.

c. To improve the attitudes of participating pupils toward themselves and the school.

2. Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation procedures utilized stressed the techniques of observation and interview. The observations included attendance at a bus trip, observation at reading classes in each school, and observation of the speech therapist and the mathematics specialist conducting their particular groups. Special attention was given to the work that was done by the educational assistants who were assisting the specialists.

Interviews were conducted with the principals of the schools, the individual teacher specialists, the educational assistants, and the one family assistant. Here, an effort was made to ascertain the values of each phase of the program as seen by the particular people in charge.

Among the questions asked were the following:

1. How do you choose the children for the program?
2. What goals have you set for the children?
3. How do you propose to attain these goals?
4. How do you intend to measure your success?
5. How effective is the program?

3. Program Implementation

At School A, the educational assistant, a neighborhood parent, worked directly with the remedial teacher in setting up and implementing the program. The program consisted of three days of remedial work with three grades of children - third, fourth, and fifth. There were forty-five children included in the remedial reading program: third grade - twenty, fourth grade - five, and fifth grade - twenty.

The aim of the remedial program was to raise the reading level of those children who would benefit most from this type of program. Excluded from this program were all children with language or behavior problems; the program attempted to focus on those children who would show improvement.

The remedial project was situated in a separate room, in the basement of the convent, across the street from the school. The room was bright with charts of various colors and purpose; it had numerous books, pictures and mobiles on display and there was a circular table and individual desks set up for the children.

In one third grade class observed, the children were working in two groups: one group was seated at the circular desk playing a phonics game; the purpose of the game was to distinguish the hard c sound from the soft c sound. The teacher was working with them.

The educational assistant was working with a smaller group of children, reading Cinderella and asking the children, now and then, whether a word had a hard or a soft c sound.

The educational assistant worked skillfully and swiftly, holding the children's attention, while at the same time asking them which was the c sound they heard.

The educational assistant worked closely with the reading specialist in carrying out the program, and was considered to be almost indispensible. The educational assistant was familiar with all the activities in the room, could operate the overhead projector, the film strip machine, and the tape recorder. She also made many of the charts in the room, and she worked individually or in small groups with the children.

At this school, there was also a trip program. Though the program called for participation only by those children eligible for this program, as it was intended to aid reading improvement, the principal decided to extend the program to all grades. She felt the trip program would supplement and aid all children in reading if the trip were planned for and read about.

Each class in the school went on a trip during the year; it was included in their curriculum, planned for, discussed in class, and reviewed after the visit, and gave rise to various types of follow-up activity. The class teacher was the person in charge of the trip and one or two parents were usually invited to attend. The program provided the bus and admission fees.

At School B, the program called for two educational assistants, five days a week, six hours a day, for a total of one hundred and fifty days. They were to work with the specialists provided by Central Board of Education funds. A family assistant was budgeted for two days a week for a total of sixty days, to work exclusively with the guidance counselor.

The family assistant worked only two months, left, and was not replaced. Another change in the program occurred when two full time educational assistants could not be found. Therefore, the principal employed two adults three days a week each, and another person four days a week for a total of ten days a week.

The duties of the educational assistants varied according to the specialist to whom they were assigned. In the reading class, which met twice a week, there were four groups of children for a total of forty children being aided, from the fourth through the eighth grade. At the outset, the reading specialist diagnosed the individual child's reading strengths and weaknesses and then assigned him to an appropriate group, gave individual assignments that included phonics, individual and group reading and dictionary work.

The educational assistant helped by setting up the materials for each group, working with individuals and groups. She was especially helpful with those children who spoke Greek and needed the educational assistant to help them with their new language, English. The educational assistant also marked papers and, in general, helped see that the time spent with the children was spent efficiently and productively. This was accomplished by freeing the specialist of many duties that would have taken much time in preparation and follow-up.

The specialist in mathematics also diagnosed the individual child's math strengths and weaknesses in the beginning of the term, testing those children class teachers judged to be retarded by two years or more. Based on the test results, the children were placed in groups according to their similarity in deficiencies.

Forty-eight children were in the program: five from the third grade, seven from the fourth grade, ten from the sixth grade, and sixteen from the seventh grade. Two groups were organized on the seventh grade level. The focus of remedial work was different for each group. The third and fourth grades concentrated on computation skills, while the sixth and seventh grades concentrated on problem solving. There were no texts available, no curriculum, and no materials; the creativity of the specialist was tested weekly and she met the test admirably, supplying interesting mimeographed materials for individual and group work. The educational assistant was an enormous help in this situation as she did the mimeographing and worked individually and in groups with the children.

Both the mathematics and the reading program were conducted in storage rooms that were the only space available in a very crowded school.

The speech therapist came once a week. She worked with twenty children assigned to groups according to their problem. The children were given exercises and singing and speaking practice. The educational assistant helped each child with his exercises. This program also had no room, and so the speech therapist had to use whatever space was available at the time.

The guidance counselor came once a week and was interested in seeing parents at home and school. She talked to those parents whose children needed special services. The parent assistant acted as interpreter and area resource person, aiding both the counselor and the parents.

4. Program Effectiveness

Although the results of pre- and post-testing were available at both schools, the evaluator was not permitted access to these data. In this district, as in several others, the division of authority between Central and District offices led Title I teachers to consider test results sacrosanct, and not open to inspection by other than Central Board of Education personnel.

While the test results were not available at School A, the principal expressed satisfaction that the program was highly successful, and that the children had shown great strides in reading because of the special attention given.

In School B, the principal summarized some of the test data, although exact scores were not made available. In reading, of the forty children included in the program, all scored from one half year to two years above their previous test score, with only one exception - one child attained the same reading score.

In mathematics, the results were more dramatic. The children all scored more than one year above their previous score, with one child scoring two years higher than his previous mark. But, as the principal stated, the reading grades attained were not the only measure of improvement. Both the regular class teachers and the students felt that there had been a definite improvement in their work; and they felt it was mainly due to the individual attention they received through these remedial services.

As for the children referred to the speech and guidance specialists, the results are not quite as tangible. The principal, teachers, and educational assistants were in accord that the children referred were in need of attention, and had been helped. It is felt that even if the children had not shown signs of benefit from the services rendered, that they would show improvement in time.

Based upon such data as were available, it would appear that some improvement in reading, and considerable improvement in mathematics can be attributed to the program. Unfortunately, no data can be advanced concerning pupil improvement in attitudes. Personnel, in both schools were very resistant to a suggestion that attitude scales, similar to those used in other evaluations, be utilized. It was deemed to be unwise to press for permission to do so. In the opinion of the teachers and paraprofessionals, considerable growth in these areas was achieved.

5. Recommendations

This program apparently has succeeded in meeting its stated objectives in the areas of reading and mathematics, and provision should be made for continuing the remedial work that is now provided. Some suggestions are offered for consideration by the District:

1. Provide funds to enable the program to function over the entire year.

2. Provide more adequate facilities for the program at School B.

3. Reexamine the present administrative structure of the program, particularly the existing division of authority between Central and District offices, to provide for more efficient program organization and control.

K. DISTRICT 31 - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

The original request for funding of the Non-Public School Component of the ESEA Title I decentralized programs in District 31 was submitted to the Board of Education's Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs on September 29, 1970. The Component had been planned by a group which included representatives of the District Title I staff, the Non-Public schools, public schools, and community organizations interested in the education of disadvantaged children.

The program proposed to provide enrollment to children in grades 1-8, who were in need of specialized help in physical education, science, library work, and speech. The special instruction was to be carried on in small groups, during the normal school day from November 1 to June 30.

The proposed program was disapproved by the Title I office of the State Education Department. The District was asked to submit a new program; after a number of changes and the passage of several months, a new program was submitted and accepted the last week in March.

The new program provided for Corrective Reading services by nine Corrective Reading Teachers and three Educational Assistants, as follows:

School	Teachers	Educational Assistants
A	1 1/5	1
B	2	
C	2	
D	1 3/5	1
E	1	
F	1 1/5	1
	9	3

Instruction was to be carried on in small groups during the regular school day. Pupils who were retarded in reading were to be referred by classroom teachers. The program was to function for the rest of the school year.

The program also provided for educational equipment and supplied such as overhead projectors, film strip projectors, films, film strips, tapes, charts, library books, periodicals, newspapers, workbooks.

1. Program Objectives

The sole objective of the program, as stated by the District, was to "improve reading achievement among participating pupils."

2. Evaluation Procedures

Since standardized tests were not given at the beginning and the end of the program period, evaluation was based on other data. All six schools were visited; corrective reading sessions were observed; materials used were examined; principals, corrective reading teachers, educational assistants, and a sampling of pupils and classroom teachers were interviewed. In addition, the coordinator of the program and the district Title I coordinator were also interviewed.

3. Program Implementation and Effectiveness

Subject to the severe limitations of the short duration of the program and the non-delivery of equipment and supplies, the program was considered fairly successful. The advantage of decentralization was emphasized by all six principals: they were able to recruit local people, both professionals and non-professionals, orient and supervise them. The persons selected knew the school, the children, the parents and the neighborhood.

As a consequence, the corrective reading teachers who were recruited needed little time for orientation. They felt at ease with the regular staff of the school and the children. Observation of their work with remedial groups gave ample evidence of their excellent rapport with children; in interviews, it was clear that relationships between classroom teachers and the corrective reading specialists were very good.

The major handicap faced by the corrective reading teachers was lack of supplies. Because the program was so late in getting started, few supplies were delivered, and the project personnel were forced to depend on the books used in the regular classroom. This, they felt, made more for repetition than for the use of innovative procedures. Observation indicated that the specialists used a wide range of teacher-prepared rexographed material, but use of audio-visual aids was infrequent.

A small sample of 24 children were selected at random for interviewing. Of this group, 19 (79.3%) felt that they had been helped to understand their regular work in class because of their participation in the program. The teachers of these children agreed that the program had led to heightened interest and performance in class by these children.

4. Recommendations

This program was in operation for such a short time that it was impossible to develop more than teacher and supervisor opinion concerning its effectiveness. If this considered judgment of school personnel may be looked upon as a valid criterion of effectiveness, this program merits continuance. The following suggestions for change are directed to the administrative aspects of the program:

1. The planning and submission of a program to the Central Board of Education Title I Office should be completed at a much earlier date, so that the program could be instituted in September.

2. There should be a coordinator for non-public school programs in the District Title I office.

3. Provision should be made for local procurement of supplies.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted in Chapter II, this report, covering the 1970-1971 school year, differs in many respects from that prepared for the 1969-1970 school year. During the current year, unlike the approach used in 1969-1970, many of the Community Districts elected to have their decentralized ESEA Title I programs evaluated by an agency of their own choice, rather than by the Central Board of Education. As a consequence, many agencies were involved in the evaluation of projects, conducted by the Districts, that permitted participation of non-public school pupils. This was particularly true of those projects that serviced both public and non-public school children in a single program.

This evaluation report is limited to two aspects of the total program of non-public school involvement in decentralized ESEA Title I activities: (1) evaluation of non-public school participation in the planning process that resulted in the organization of decentralized ESEA Title I programs; and (2) evaluation of the effectiveness of those programs organized by the Districts in which services were made available solely to non-public schools.

Bearing in mind the limited scope of this evaluation report, the following suggestions are advanced for consideration by the Central Board of Education and the Community Districts:

1. The decentralized ESEA Title I Umbrella in a given Community District should be looked upon as a single package, embodying services to disadvantaged children enrolled in both public and non-public schools. It would follow, therefore, that planning for programs to be directed to both public and non-public school pupils should be regarded as a unitary

activity. In instance after instance, even casual reading of the requests for funding submitted by the Districts made it clear that planning sessions of Title I Advisory Committees, or similar bodies, were devoted primarily to a consideration of needs of, and programs for, public school children, and that attention was directed to the needs of, and programs for, non-public school children only after the public school program had been completely delineated. The impression was left that the program for non-public schools was a relatively minor consideration. This impression was heightened as one noted the requests for modifications of the programs that were originally submitted; so many of the modifications that were requested dealt with changes in the non-public school program. Indeed, in some Districts, more than half of the school year had elapsed before a program could be implemented in the non-public schools in those Districts. The evaluation team can attribute this failure to implement programs in non-public schools early in the school year only to poor program planning, in that District personnel and Advisory Committee members tend to think in terms of ESEA Title I programs for public and non-public schools, rather than in terms of programs for children. In order to make more certain that programs for non-public schools be looked upon as more than a minor aspect of the work of Advisory Committees, it is recommended that:

2. Greater provision should be made for the involvement of non-public school personnel (particularly the administrators of non-public schools) in the planning stage of the development of the Title I Umbrella. While it is true that the record of such participation was much better this year than it was last year, there was still a group constituting some 15 non-public school administrators who reported that they did not participate in planning activities. Moreover, there was a group of 25 per cent of

such administrators who did not deign to reply to a questionnaire concerning such participation. Thus one can be certain that only 60 per cent of the non-public schools were directly represented in the planning process.

To be sure, a development was noted during the current year that was not in evidence in 1969-1970. In several of the Districts, the administrators of the non-public schools selected one of their number to serve as their representative on the Advisory Committee. In many instances, they met with their own representative rather than the Advisory Committee; the representative then presented their views to the Advisory Committee and to District personnel.

The evaluation team has no quarrel with this approach; there is much to be gained from such a caucus technique for identifying school needs. It should be noted, however, that such a procedure makes non-public school personnel as guilty of looking at one side of the public - non-public school coin as public school personnel. The caucus deals solely with the concerns of the non-public schools; it considers programs for non-public schools. Like their public school colleagues, they lose sight of the need to consider programs for disadvantaged children.

In few of the Districts did members of the evaluation team sense that a true cooperative approach to the development of a Title I program had been effected; rather, the mutual distrust noted in the evaluation of the 1969-1970 school year program was still evident in many Districts. To some degree, the development of the non-public school caucus represented an effort, on the part of non-public school administrators, to make certain that they were apprised of developments in program planning and implementation. It is clear, however, that this technique was not completely successful in solving the problem of communication:

3. Improved lines of communication should be established between Title I Coordinators and the administrators of the non-public schools. At the present time, there does not appear to be any district mechanism for notifying principals of non-public schools that their pupils are eligible to participate in a given program. Indeed, fully one-sixth of the respondents to a questionnaire indicated that they were unaware of eligibility to participate in one or more of the programs that had been organized in the Districts in which their schools were located; if data were available for non-respondents to the questionnaire, this proportion would undoubtedly have been much higher.

A similar recommendation was made following last year's evaluation. Little improvement has been noted. Evidently, few Title I coordinators routinely advise non-public school principals of their eligibility to participate in a given program; responsibility for such notification is still delegated to the program coordinator. Rather surprisingly, the tendency on the part of the non-public school administrators to meet as a separate group, and to designate one of their number as a representative to meet with the Advisory Committee and the Title I coordinator, has not served to better communication concerning program eligibility. Evidently, this evolving pattern has not been so firmly established that all problems have been resolved; some non-public school principals evidently are still not too certain of administrative procedures involved in meeting with the caucus group.

Improved communication, however, is not the only administrative problem that needs consideration:

4. The relationship of centralized and decentralized ESEA Title I programs merits reexamination to eliminate the existing conflict of authority. At the present time, many of the non-public schools participate

in centralized Title I programs, where so-called "Title I" teachers, who are licensed New York City school teachers, are assigned to non-public schools to provide remedial work in reading, mathematics, etc.; these Title I teachers are assisted by paraprofessionals. These programs are coordinated by the Central Board of Education, and personnel assigned are supervised by the Central Board.

In some instances, local Districts, in settling upon their decentralized programs for non-public schools, have elected to "plug-in" to these centralized programs. Monies from the Districts' allocation for decentralized programs are transferred to the budget for the centralized program; at this point, the local District, in effect, no longer plays a role in the implementation of the program.

In other instances, however, the local District supplies paraprofessionals for supportive services in non-public schools. Often, these paraprofessionals are assigned to assist Title I teachers and a jurisdictional conflict immediately arises. Who is responsible for supervision of these paraprofessionals? Who is to determine their specific duties? Who is to determine the effectiveness of their service?

The dual administrative authority in these instances is clearly an unsatisfactory arrangement. The difficulty, in many Districts, that the evaluation team experienced in obtaining data concerning pupil growth stemmed, in large measure, from this dual administrative control. Principals of the schools in which these programs operated expressed their dissatisfaction with this arrangement; they were uncertain concerning to whom they should turn in the event that difficulty arose.

To the members of the evaluation team, either the use of the "plug-in" device, or the organization of completely decentralized programs, supervised in whole by the local District, were administratively acceptable.

The use of the intermediate approach, in which the District, via provision of additional personnel, supplemented a centralized program, represented poor administrative practice. The preferred approach would be one that insures that programs developed for non-public schools be tailored specifically in terms of the needs of the pupils attending such schools. It would follow, therefore that:

5. The functions to be performed by teachers and paraprofessionals serving in non-public schools should be determined jointly by the program coordinator and the administrator of the non-public school. Where the major objective of a given program is providing a corps of paraprofessionals to serve in non-public schools (and many of the existing programs take this form), the assignment to specific duties should rest with the principal of that school. Principals of non-public schools must be given much more freedom to deploy personnel in accordance with the educational needs of the school.

Acceptance of this recommendation, of course, would mean that principals of non-public schools would play a greater role in the total Title I framework. Members of the evaluation team suggest that this role be expanded:

6. Administrators of non-public schools should participate in the process of recruitment and training of Title I teachers and paraprofessionals. Throughout the course of this evaluative study, principals of non-public schools voiced the complaint that "the people working with our children don't know anything about our school and what we are trying to do." The involvement of non-public school personnel in the program of recruitment and training would go a long way in eliminating this negative feeling.

It must be emphasized that, particularly in the case of paraprofessionals assigned as supportive personnel in decentralized programs, present provisions for orientation, training, and up-grading are virtually non-existent. This is not true in those programs that are "plug-ins" or centrally administered; paraprofessionals assigned to non-public schools in such programs do receive inservice training and are eligible to participate in the Career Ladder program. When the local District retains administrative control, however, inservice training is rarely noted. Such training is clearly the responsibility of the local District; administrators of non-public schools should be invited to share in this training program.

Having administrators of non-public schools play a greater role in program planning and in staff recruitment would be a major force in program development and would be instrumental in fostering program implementation early in the school year. Early implementation, however, is only the first step:

7. Greater efforts must be made to make certain that supplies required for a given program be available when needed. In many instances, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals assigned to non-public school programs complained about delivery of supplies, materials, and equipment. Evidently, the over-burdened supply mechanism of the Central Board of Education has been unable to cope with the additional burden of obtaining supplies needed in these non-public school programs. The evaluation team feels that some arrangement must be developed that will permit the local District, through the program coordinator, to purchase supplies and equipment on a decentralized basis. Guidelines incorporating the usual safeguards for such local purchase should be developed by the Central Board.

APPENDIX

Members of the Evaluation Team:

Evaluation Director: Dr. Joseph Justman
Institute for Research and Evaluation
School of Education, Fordham University

Research Associates: Dr. Jesse Bacher
Mrs. Wendy Oxman
Mr. George Weinberg

Research Assistants: Sister Loretta Butler
Mr. Louis Ciota
Mrs. Ruth Hochberg
Mr. Ronald McVey
Sister Louise Zdunich

Clerical Assistants: Miss Ellen Alberts
Mr. Thomas Barratta
Mr. Scott Gilbert
Miss Jacqueline Himmel
Mr. Paul Mottola

Secretarial Assistants: Miss Laura Morra
Miss Diane Piro